HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
VOLUME XXX JANUARY, 1937 NUMBER 1

CONFESSION OF SINS AND THE CLASSICS [1]

RAFFAELE PETTAZZONI
UNIVERSITY OF ROME

I

1. In the first of his letters ex Ponto (vv. 51–58) Ovid mentions the confession of sins practised in the religion of Isis by the faithful (in the presence of a priest?). One man, seated before the altar of the goddess (*Isiacos focos*, v. 52), confessed that he had offended her divinity (*numen violasse fatentem*, v. 51); a second, deprived of his sight in punishment for some similar crime,[2] went along the public road crying out that he had merited the castigation (*se meruisse*, v. 54). Ovid affirms that he had seen all this with his own eyes (*vidi ego*, v. 51). It may be that his *vidi ego* is purely rhetoric.[3] Confession of sins, however, was certainly practised in Egypt *ab antiquo*, as is proved by a group of Theban inscriptions of the epoch of the XIXth Dynasty (about 1300 B.C.) dedicated to various divinities, amongst whom is a local goddess assimilated to Isis-Hathor.[4] Moreover, ophthalmia was very common in Egypt.[5]

[1] This lecture was delivered in German (Das Sündenbekenntnis in der Antike) on September 30th, 1935, before the Royal Society of Letters at Lund and some days later at the Göteborgs Högskola. The matter here dealt with is found in an extended form in the IIIrd Volume of my work on the Confessione dei peccati (Bologna, N. Zanchelli, 1929–36): I (Primitives: Ancient America, Japan, China, Brahmanism, Jainism, Buddhism); II (Egypt, Babylonia, Israel, Southern Arabia); III (Syria, Hittites, Asia Minor, Greece). — Vol. I has been enlarged and translated into French: La Confession des péchés, I–II, Paris, E. Leroux, 1931–32.

[2] Cf. Juvenal, Sat. XIII, 92 sq.: decernat quodcumque volet de corpore nostro Isis et irato feriat mea *lumina* sistro; Martial, Ep. IV, 30.

[3] Cf. Tibullus, I, 2, 91; Horace, Sat., I, 8, 23; Virgil, Aen., III, 623; etc.: Norden, Aeneis VI Buch[3], p. 277.

[4] A. Erman, Denksteine aus der Thebanischen Gräberstadt, Sitzungsber. Berl. Akad., 1911, 1086–1110; B. Gunn, The Religion of the Poor in Ancient Egypt, Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, 1916, 81 ff.; G. Roeder, Urkunden der Religion der Ägypter, Jena, 1923, 52 ff.

[5] Many prescriptions for ophthalmia in the Ebers Papyrus (New Kingdom). Eyes

The existence of penitential practices in the religion of Isis at Rome is indirectly attested by Juvenal also in a well known passage of the VIth Satire which derides the Roman matrons and their fanatical devotion to oriental divinities and their exotic priests. Isis was the object of unbounded fanaticism (Juven., VI, 535–541); the matron reposed all her trust in the Egyptian priest (*Anubiacus*). She went to him every time she had transgressed the precept of abstinence from marital embrace on forbidden days. This was a grave sin which aroused the wrath of the goddess; and the serpent, which she held in her hand and was wont to direct against the offenders, well demonstrated this wrath by the movements of its head. Hence the woman must expect a severe punishment, unless the priest intervened with opportune prayers and offerings to obtain from Osiris forgiveness for the crime (*veniam culpae*, v. 540) committed by his client.

Aelian (De natura animalium, XI, 17) also tells of a sacred serpent — certainly the serpent of Isis — guarded in a tower at Metelis, a city of the Delta, where the cult of Isis-Hathor is attested also by Roman coins. The chief of the cult servants, who had to give food to the serpent every day, once spied upon it whilst it ate and was terribly punished: driven out of his mind, he confessed his sin (ὡς ἠσέβησεν ὁμολογήσας), then became dumb, and after a little fell dead. Here we have another (indirect) evidence of confession in relation to the religion of Isis.

2. (*a*) This is not the only testimony given by Ovid regarding confession. In the Metamorphoses (XI, 129–143, ed. Magnus) is related the adventure of King Midas. Tormented by the thirst with which Dionysus had punished him for his greed, Midas raises his arms to heaven (*ad caelumque manus et splendida brachia tollens*, v. 131), confesses his sin ('*da veniam, Lenaee pater, peccavimus*,' v. 132) and invokes pardon from the offended god; and behold, the god, merciful towards the con-

---

of gold and silver dedicated as *ex votos* to Isis and Serapis at Delos: Roussel, Les cultes égyptiens à Délos, 290; cf. Cumont, Cat. codd. astr. graec., VIII, 4, 190, n. 1; Gunn, loc. cit., 89.

fessing sinner (*peccasse fatentem*, v. 134), pardons him and tells him what he must do; i.e., he must follow the course of the river Pactolus as far as its source, and there must immerse himself completely in the frothy waters (*subde caput corpusque simul*, v. 141). Thus his sin will be cleansed and dispersed (*elue crimen*, v. 141). This vivid picture is drawn from reality and portrays a rite actually practised. The gesture of raising the hands to heaven is ritual, as we know from numerous reliefs and other monuments representing two raised arms.[6] The bath by immersion, or baptism,[7] is also ritual. The confession of Midas is nothing but the reflection of a confessional practice, actually carried out in some cult. What is this cult? I believe we can individualise it with sufficient certainty. Midas was king of Phrygia and the Pactolus ran through Lydia. Over both Phrygian and Lydian territory extended a region wherein numerous confessional inscriptions, dedicated to various local divinities,[8] have been found. The dedicator had committed a sin (*ἡμάρτησεν* Steinleitner, nr. 5; *ἁμ[αρτήσας]* St., nr. 20); the divinity punished him; he repented of his guilt, confessed it (*ἐξομολογοῦμαι*, M A M A, IV nr. 289; *ὁμολογῶ*, ib., nr. 279) and implored pardon; the divinity showed her miraculous power and saved him, whereupon he erected the stela on which his experience is narrated, in lasting memory of the miracle and as a warning to others. These inscriptions from Phrygia and Lydia, written in a barbaric Greek, are almost all of the IInd and IIIrd centuries A.D. (with some rare exceptions of the Ist century); but there is every likelihood that they represent the

[6] F. Cumont, Il sole vindice dei delitti ed il simbolo delle mani alzate, Memorie della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia, I, 1, Rome, 1923, 65 sqq.; Nuovi epitafi col simbolo della preghiera al dio vindice, Rendiconti della Pontif. Accad. Rom. di Arch., V (1926–27), Rome, 1928, 69 sqq.; Invocation au Soleil accompagnée des 'mains supines,' Syria, 1933, 385 sqq.

[7] Baptism and confession are associated in the penitential rite of John the Baptist: *καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, ἐξομολογούμενοι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν* (Matth., 3, 6).

[8] Fr. Steinleitner, Die Beicht im Zusammenhange mit der sakralen Rechtspflege in der Antike, Leipzig, 1913; Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua, IV (Manchester, 1933), nrr. 265–312; Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum, VI (Lugduni Batavorum, 1932), nrr. 248–260.

late survival and continuance *in situ* of a confessional practice of very ancient origin. From some inscriptions of the group it appears that ritual ablutions were practised also in the local cults [9] to which the inscriptions belong. Moreover, one of the inscriptions affords evidence of the existence of a special religious association of καταλουστικοί,[10] devotees of the goddess Meter and of Men, who practised ritual ablutions by total immersion.[11]

(*b*) Ovid, again, in the Fasti (IV, 305–327) relates the episode of Claudia Quinta, the heroine whose name was associated in legend with the introduction of the image of Magna Mater into Rome in 204 B.C. The ship that carried the idol ran upon a sandbank at the mouth of the Tiber and no force availed to drag it back into the river. At this point Claudia Quinta intervened. Here, too, the scene unfolds, as it were, before our eyes, — a scene full of ritual acts and moments. Claudia sprinkles her head three times with the water of the river (*ter caput irrorat*, v. 315), three times she raises her hands to heaven (*ter tollit in aethera palmas*, v. 315), then kneels and, addressing the goddess, pronounces these solemn words: 'If I am not pure, let me die (and may my death be the proof of my sin); but if I am pure, let me be able to drag the ship with this rope.' Apart from the special situation created by Claudia's appeal to the 'divine judgment,' we have here again the (triple) ritual ablution, the gesture (repeated three times) of the raised hands [12] and a sort of confession as well, albeit one dependent on the result of the ordeal: should this be unfavourable, Claudia would confess that she had merited the chastisement (*meruisse fatebor*, v. 321). It must, then, in my opinion, be admitted that, in Ovid's episode of Claudia Quinta, as well as in that of Midas, there may be a reflection of that same Anatolian penitential devotion of

[9] J. Zingerle, Jahreshefte des österreichischen archäologischen Instituts, 24 (1928), Beiblatt, 107 ff., nr. 3.

[10] J. Keil, A. von Premerstein, Bericht über eine zweite Reise in Lydien, Denkschriften der Wiener Akademie, 54, 2 (1911), 95 f., nr. 183.

[11] Cf. λουσαμένους κατακέφαλα in the statute of the cult founded by the Lycian Xanthos at Sunion: IG, III, nr. 74 (and 73).

[12] Cf. equally in Ovid, Metam., IV, 237 sq.: precantem, Tendentemque manus ad lumina solis. . . .

which the confessional inscriptions of Phrygia and Lydia are documents.[13] It must be borne in mind that the idol of the Magna Mater came from Phrygia (Pessinus), and that among the divinities to whom the confessional inscriptions are dedicated the chief one is a goddess designated as 'the Great Mother,' — surely the great Asiatic Mother goddess in one of her many local forms. Moreover, examples of judgment by ordeal are not lacking in the aforementioned confessional inscriptions from Phrygia and Lydia.[14]

(*c*) In the above-mentioned passage of Satire VI of Juvenal, the sketch of the matron devoted to Isis and blindly obedient to the injunction of the *Anubiacus* corresponds to that (Juven., VI, 511–526) of the female fanatic of the Magna Mater (and of Bellona) who abandons herself to the prescriptions of the *archigallos*. Here also it is a case of a penitential practice, to be performed once a year, in September, to expiate all the sins of the year (*et totum semel expiet annum*, v. 521) and so avert the threatening danger of fevers. This practice also comprised a triple immersion in the waters of the Tiber (*ter matutino Tiberi mergetur*, v. 523),[15] a total immersion (*ipsis verticibus caput abluet*, vv. 523–524), like that of Midas, followed by a painful dragging of one's self on one's knees across the Campus Martius. Moreover, the matron had to make donations to the *archigallos*, giving him amongst other things, her sumptuous robes (*xerampelinas*, v. 519). This act of giving has a precise religious significance, clearly determined by the text. The sinful woman is to be liberated from the infection of sin. Washed from her person by the triple baptismal immersion in the running water, the *miasma* with its pernicious influence (*discriminis*, v. 520) is now confined to her clothes (*in tunicas eat*, v. 521), i.e. the splendid robes which the matron wore during the year (*veteres*, v. 519) and which remained impregnated with that *miasma* issuing

[13] Reitzenstein saw a reflection of this type of piety (Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen[3], Leipzig, 1927, 138 f.) also in Tibull., I, 2, vv. 81–88.

[14] Zingerle, loc. cit., nr. 2: a mother-in-law, to refute the rumours that accused her of witchcraft to the injury of her own son-in-law, challenges the divine judgment by a conditional curse (ἀράς), but it turns out unfavourable for her; she dies and so does her son.

[15] Cf. Persius, II, 15 sq.: haec sancte ut poscas, Tiberino in gurgite mergis mane caput bis terque et noctem flumine purgas.

from the sins committed in the course of the year; this is why she must give them to the *archigallos*, and once having taken them off (*nuda*, v. 525) must no longer use them, but must put on new ones in their stead. From a scholion to the passage of Juvenal it appears that the sins of the matron were principally sexual,[16] precisely like those of the devotee of Isis (see above). All this is likewise met with in the confessional inscriptions of Asia Minor: one of them is dedicated by a woman who confesses as her sin that she had ascended to the holy place wearing a dirty dress (ἐν ῥυπαρῷ ἐπενδύτῃ, Steinleitner, nr. 13), and in this case, too, it is very probable that the dirtiness or impurity is of sexual origin, the sexual sin being the most frequent among those confessed in the said inscriptions.[17]

At this point we may ask ourselves why Ovid, the singer of love, the most sensual of the Augustan poets, showed so much interest in confessional practices. Perhaps it is not without special point. The fact is that Ovid in the last period of his life found himself in the position of a punished sinner, who confessed his sin (*duo crimina: carmen et error*: Tristia, II, 207),[18] imploring a pardon which never came. Certainly more than once in the squalid desolation of exile his memory will have returned to those penitential rites — wherever he had learned of them — whereby sinners obtained pardon for their sins from the offended divinity (a divinity more clement than his). The mention of confession in the cult of Isis occurs in one of his letters from exile (ex Ponto, v. sup.) in which he gives way to an expression of contrition so bitter and profound as to surprise us on the lips of a pagan. Now the poet no longer hopes, but from his very desperation, from the proved vanity of all his efforts, from the certainty that they will always be vain, there arises in his soul, now delivered from every consideration of personal happiness, a new feeling, which, if really disinterested, is, if we may say so, rather Christian than pagan,

[16] Scholia in Juvenalem vetustiora (ed. P. Wessner, Leipzig, 1931, 106) ad VI, 522: descendat per glaciem in flumen matrona post usum virilem.

[17] Again, one of the South Arabian confessional inscriptions is dedicated by a woman who has done penance for having worn a dirty garment: G. Ryckmans, Deux inscriptions expiatoires sabéennes, Revue Biblique, 41, 1932, 393 ff., nr. 1.

[18] Cf. Trist., III, 49–51; II, 103–107.

that is, the sense of sin in itself. There is something still more painful than suffering, and that is the consciousness of having deserved it, the consciousness of being a sinner; punishment of sin is cancelled, but the sin, never; death can put an end to exile, but cannot annul sin:

> poenitet, o! si quid miserorum creditur ulli,
> poenitet, et facto torqueor ipse meo,
> cumque sit exilium, *magis est mihi culpa dolori*
> *estque pati poenam quam meruisse minus.*
> ut mihi di faveant quibus est manifestior ipse,
> *poena potest demi, culpa perennis erit:*
> mors faciet certe, ne sim, cum venerit, exul;
> *ne non peccarim, mors quoque non faciet.*
> Ex Pont., I, 1, 59–66.

3. (*a*) Plutarch in his essay On Superstition (*περὶ δεισιδαιμονίας*) presents us with the type of the superstitious in the figure of a man who sees in every adversity the finger of God, in every contrariety of life a divine punishment for some fault committed, refuses every human remedy and relief and applies himself only to expiation and penance, blaming himself as guilty and worthy of his misfortune. This is how he does penance: 'He seats himself on the road with a sack, clothed in rags, but often he rolls naked in the mud and confesses (*ἐξαγορεύει*) some sin of his, such as having eaten or drunk this or that thing, or having gone along a road not permitted by the divinity' (Plut., De superst. 7, p. 168 C). This scene is also taken from real life. It effectively portrays the painful spectacle, to be seen especially in the vicinity of sanctuaries, of those who, stricken with some infirmity or other misfortune, attributed it to divine punishment, made public penance and publicly confessed their sins. But we can add something more; we can point out a cult to which the penitential practices, generically assigned by Plutarch to the 'superstitious,' really belong. This is the cult of the Dea Syria. In fact, in the text of Plutarch a little further on we read: 'The superstitious man believes that if anyone eats herrings or sardines the Dea Syria devours his shins, inflames his body with ulcers and consumes his liver' (Plut., De superstit., 10, p. 170 D). This is confirmed by a fragment of a lost comedy of Menander which says: 'When

the Syrii through incontinence eat some fish, they swell[19] in the feet and belly; they then take a sack and sit in the road in the dirt and propitiate the goddess by greatly humiliating themselves' (Menander, frg. 544, Kock, C A F, III, p. 164, ap. Porphyr., De abstin., IV, 15). In this 'greatly humiliating themselves' is probably implied the confession of the committed sin, of which Plutarch explicitly speaks. Thus interpreted, the fragment of Menander is, I believe, the most ancient — though indirect — evidence of confession furnished by a classic author. As Menander wrote a comedy entitled The Superstitious,[20] it is probable that the above-mentioned fragment, on which Plutarch's description of the 'superstitious' depends, belongs to it. In any case, from the combined texts of Menander and Plutarch[21] we see that the confession of sins was certainly practised in the aforesaid forms and circumstances[22] in the religion of the Dea Syria. That it was forbidden to eat fish in this religion or even to touch it, is also known from other evidence.[23]

(*b*) Among the devotees of the Dea Syria there were those who had sacrificed their virility, i.e., the Galli. They celebrated in honour of the goddess certain orgiastic and bloody rites, of which Apuleius in the Metamorphoses (VIII, 27–28) has left us an unforgettable description. They used to go around the country to take up collections, and on these occasions used to make exhibitions of themselves: abandoning themselves to their tumultuous and unbridled dances and rolling their heads

[19] Cf. Martial, IV, 43, 7–8: iuro per *Syrios* tibi *tumores*, iuro per Berecyntios furores.

[20] Cf. the characterization of the Superstitious Man by Theophrastus.

[21] Cf. also Tertullian, De poenitentia, 9.

[22] At Bambyke-Hierapolis, the 'holy city' of the Syrian Goddess (Atargatis-Derketo), the faithful who reached the sanctuary before entering the temple found a *ξόανον* representing a woman in the act of pointing out the temple itself (Lucian, De dea Syr., 39). It was explained as an image of the Queen Semiramis (daughter, according to the legend, of Derketo), who wished to be adored as a goddess, but, struck by divine punishment, confessed (*ὡμολόγεε*) her mortal nature, ordering her subjects to adore the real goddess, the Dea Syria; and this is why she was represented in the act of pointing out the temple, — the gesture implying the recognition of the goddess and the confession of her own sin.

[23] Lucian, De dea Syr., 14, cf. 45; Dittenberger, Syll.[3], nr. 997, etc.; Wächter, Reinheitsvorschriften im griechischen Kult., Giessen, 1910, 97, 2; Dölger, IXΘΥΣ II, Münster i. W., 1922, 161 ff.

on their necks till they lost consciousness; crazy with exaltation, they bit themselves till blood came and with a double-edged sword cut their arms; meanwhile, one of their number, excited and obsessed, railed loudly at himself, accusing himself of some sin committed (*semet ipsum incessere atque criminari, quasi contra fas sanctae religionis dissignasset aliquid . . .*). That is another form of confession practised in the cult of the Dea Syria.

II

4. The evidences of confession so far examined are supplied by classic writers, but the confessional practices attested by them belong neither to Greek nor to Roman religion, but to various oriental religions, and, more precisely, to three, which are all, it should be noted, religions of a great female divinity: the Egyptian Isis, the Anatolian Great Mother, and the Dea Syria. We must now ask whether there is any evidence at all of confessional practices belonging to the classic world, that is to say, whether the confession of sins was absolutely foreign to the Greek and Roman religion.

Eduard Norden in his commentary on the VIth Book of the Aeneid [24] is disposed to admit that confession of sins was practised in the Orphic religion. A connection with Orphism may indeed be admitted, as Norden shows, (*a*) for the apocalypsis of Thespesios in Plutarch's De sera numinis vindicta, where the father of Thespesios in hell is compelled amidst torments to confess (ὁμολογεῖν, De ser. num. vind., 22, p. 566 F) continually — and then also in the presence of his son — a crime committed by him, which in life he had always succeeded in keeping secret, (*b*) (less directly) for the *katabasis* of Aeneas in Virgil and the accompanying description of hell, where the souls of the damned are compelled by Rhadamanthys to confess (*subigitque fateri*, Aen., VI, 567) the sins for which each of them, with vain subterfuge, neglected in life to make expiation, always deferring it to the supreme hour. But this confession of the damned in the other world, even if it shows some degree of

[24] Ed. Norden, Aeneis VI Buch³, 276.

Orphic influence, is not enough to prove that confession was really practised *in vita* by the Orphics. On this point evidence is completely lacking. We may infer from some indications that some Orphic communities in Asia Minor very probably knew the confession of sins practised there in certain local cults according to the already mentioned confessional inscriptions of Lydia and Phrygia (v. sup.). In fact, one of these confessional inscriptions found in Meonia (Lydia) and two other inscriptions from the same territory are dedicated to the Meter Hipta (an ancient goddess once adored, it seems, by the Hittites and Mitanni[25]), whose name occurs again in the Orphic hymns (48 and 49, Abel) as that of the wet-nurse of Dionysus. The neoplatonic Proclus, in his commentary on Plato's Timaeus, tells us that there also existed some περὶ τῆς Ἵπτας λόγοι attributed to Orpheus. If the Orphics knew the goddess Hipta (of whom there is no trace beyond Maeonia), they probably knew also the confession of sins which was practised in her cult. On the other hand, the warning of Phlegyas in the Virgilian hell, *discite iustitiam moniti et non temnere divos* (Aen., VI, 620), in which Norden sees another indication of Orphic influence, seems to be the exact translation of a stereotyped formula very frequently met with in the Phrygian and Lydian confessional inscriptions: παραγγέλλω μηδένα καταφρονεῖν τοῦ θεοῦ, κτλ., 'I warn every one not to despise the divinity, because if he does he will have my stela as a model' (i.e., 'what has happened to me will happen to him'). But even these connections (which have escaped Norden) are not enough to prove that the Orphics actually practised the confession of sins. The eschatological scenes, both in Virgil and Plutarch, as quoted above, represent but a reflection of the Anatolian confession, — a reflection which shows us once more the preponderant interest eschatology had for Orphism. That process of adaptation, of assimilation which the goddess Hipta — a local form of the Anatolian Magna Mater — had to undergo to become, in Orphism, the mythical wet-nurse of Dionysus was applied equally to the confession of sins, with the result that it became projected, for the Orphics, into the world beyond.

[25] See my Confessione dei peccati, III, 97.

5. Apart from Orphism, where the confession of sins appears, as it were, only in eschatological projection, it may be said that there is one place only in the ancient Greek world where a kind of confession was actually practised. This place, of extreme interest from a religious point of view, is the Island of Samothrace, sacred to the cult of the Cabiri. These mysterious divinities, which suggested to Goethe some ironical verses in Faust, had already attracted the attention of Schelling, who in his 'fantastical' speech, 'Ueber die Gottheiten von Samothrake,' delivered at the Bavarian Academy of Sciences in 1815, speaks expressly of a 'Bekenntnis,' of a 'sogennante Beichte,' existing in the Cabirian religion. The moderns[26] generally connect it with the mysteries and initiation; some go so far as to establish a correspondence between confession and initiation in the Samothracian religion, and confession and eucharist in the Christian.[27] But in what does this confession of Samothrace really consist? The only evidence is furnished by two anecdotes in the pseudo-Plutarchian collection of Apophthegmata Laconica. At the time when the Spartan naval commander Antalkidas was being initiated into the mysteries of Samothrace, the priest asked him what particularly serious sin he had committed in his life. Antalkidas replies: 'If I have done anything of the sort, the gods must know it' ('there is no need that I should tell it to you') (Plut., Apophth. Lacon., p. 217 D). The same anecdote, with an equally irreverent reply, is told about Lysander, with this variation, that he is presented, not in the act of being initiated, but, of consulting the oracle (Plut., Apophth. Lacon., p. 229 D).

The historical value (probably small) of the anecdote does not concern us, the religious value does. We find in it, projected on to the figures of Lysander and Antalkidas, the reflection of a ritual and religious reality existing at Samothrace. We know, in fact, from Hesychius that in the religion of the Cabiri there was a special priest called *κόης*, *κοίης* (Hesych. s. v.), charged

[26] O. Kern, Reformen der griechischen Religion, Halle a. S., 1918, 16; Die griechischen Mysterien der klassischen Zeit, Berlin, 1927, 30.

[27] O. Crusius, Sitzungsber. bayr. Akad., 1910, 4, 115, 1; F. Steinleitner, Die Beicht, Leipzig, 1913, 118 ff.

with the purifying of homicides. Livy too (XLV, 5) tells us of certain *iudicia more maiorum comparata* ('processes conducted according to the ancient custom') by which at Samothrace men accused of murder were tried, the profaning presence of the guilty being incompatible with the sanctity of the island. Lysander and Antalkidas were homicides in a certain sense, for they had shed much blood in naval battles. Their position, then, before the priests is the same as that of homicides needing purification. The confession of Samothrace, then, had its 'Sitz im Leben,' not in the initiation to the mysteries, but in the catharsis of homicides, and was to be made by the guilty on the demand of the priest deputed for this purpose, — such a liturgy of demand and reply being paralleled in penitential practices of other peoples and religions.

According to Reitzenstein [28] the confession in Samothrace was a sporadic survival at the end of the Vth century B.C. (here a belief in the historical value of the two anecdotes in Plutarch is implied) of a confessional practice originally diffused throughout the Greek and Roman world as well as elsewhere, and then revived in the Hellenistic epoch under the influence of oriental religions. This hypothesis is enunciated by Reitzenstein without proof; and proof is indeed impossible. What is certain is that the island of Samothrace entered late into the historical and cultural orbit of the Greek world and long retained the elements of its original pre-Greek civilisation. According to Herodotus (II, 51), the Cabiric mysteries, and therefore the Cabiric divinities themselves, were originally 'Pelasgic,' that is, pre-Greek. The language, also, like the religion, had been pre-Greek, and Diodorus attests (V, 47) that even in his time many terms derived from the ancient idiom of the autochthonous population were still in use in cult. In all likelihood, κόης, the name of the priest of the Cabiri deputed to the catharsis of homicides, is one of these survivals of the primitive 'pelasgic' language. The same term with the same meaning belonged to the Lydian language, since in the Lydian inscriptions *kaveś* recurs in the sense of 'priest,' and, again, in a group of Greek inscriptions from Sardis, καύειν (accusative)

[28] R. Reitzenstein, Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen³, Leipzig, 1927, 137, 1.

recurs with the sense of 'priestess'; καύης, with a meaning analogous to 'priest,' is already found in Hipponax (frg. 2, Bergk), who knew the language of the Lydian population in the Ionian colonies of Asia Minor. (On the other hand Herodotus tells us (I, 35) that the Lydian catharsis of homicides is very similar to that of the Greeks.) The 'Pelasgic,' i.e. pre-Greek, languages of Samothrace had then, it appears, special connections with the Asiatic languages. The very name of the Cabiri, too, is met with in the place names of Asia Minor (Κάβειρον, τὰ Κάβειρα are the names of certain mountains in Phrygia and Pontos, Strabo, X, p. 472, XII, p. 556). And not only the ancient pre-Greek language but also the ancient 'pelasgic' religion shows particular connections with Asia Minor. Thus, the principal Cabiric divinity of Samothrace, called by his esoteric name, Axieros, was a kind of 'Demeter,' namely a figure of the great Mother Goddess. In Lemnos, another seat of the religion of the Cabiri, the principal divinity was also a goddess, herself Lemnos by name, according to Stephanos of Byzantium a μεγάλη θεός and therefore related to the Asiatic Cybele and to many other local goddesses of Asia Minor, all of them, like Cybele herself, forms of the great Anatolian Mother. And since in the local Asiatic cults of this Mother Goddess confession of sins was practised even in later times, it is probable that the Samothracian confession also belonged originally to that primitive 'Pelasgic' substratum, which presents so many signs of special connection with the Asiatic world. In Asia, in fact, and in the ancient East generally, the confession of sins was widespread. That it was primitively diffused in Greece too, as Reitzenstein says, is a purely gratuitous affirmation. If it were so, it would be necessary to explain why it had disappeared everywhere except in Samothrace. The Samothracian confession is best explained not as a survival of a practice anciently diffused in the Greek world and later lost in it but as an extension westward of that oriental cultural and religious area where confession is evidenced from the IInd millennium B.C. up to the IIIrd century A.D. Confession of sins, as it existed at Samothrace, and at Samothrace only, far from demonstrating the existence of confes-

sion in the Greek world generally, furnishes rather, by its very exceptional character and its Asiatic connections as well, the proof that the Greek world, in the classic sense of the word, never knew the confession of sins. The other evidence for confession in classic authors concerns, as we have seen, the confession which was practised in different oriental religions. Among the Italians as well as among the other Indo-european peoples of Europe evidence concerning confession of sins is lacking. In India it probably went back, as in the Near East, to the pre-Aryan substratum. In Iran it appears with the religion of Zarathustra, but only in the late phase of it, in Parsism properly so-called, and therefore in eventual dependence on external influences, whether Manichean, Buddhist or Christian.

To sum up, my detailed researches lead me to think that confession of sins, in the Greek world as well as among the other Indo-european peoples, did not belong originally to the Indo-european element.

ROSALIAE SIGNORUM *

A. S. HOEY

Balliol College, Oxford

V[I] i[du]s maias ob rosalias sign[or]um [s]uppl[icatio

. . . . . .

Pr[idie] kal. Iunias ob rosalias sign[oru]m supp[li]c[a]tio (vacat)

In the campaign of 1931–32 at Dura-Europos on the Euphrates there was found among the military archives in the temple of Artemis Azzanathcona a papyrus document containing a list of the festivals which were officially celebrated by the Roman garrison in the city. This document, of unique interest and importance, placed by internal evidence in the reign of Severus Alexander between the years A.D. 223 and 225, contains among its entries the two lines quoted above.[1] In them is prescribed for celebration on two different dates a hitherto unknown festival which is of some little importance both for the religious life of the Roman army and for the history of Roman festivals during the Empire. An attempt will be made in this paper to interpret its nature and to touch briefly on both these aspects of its significance.

The name of the festival first calls for remark. That the word "signorum" is grammatically dependent on "rosalias" and not on "supplicatio" is conclusively shown by the invariable use of the dative case after "supplicatio" throughout the rest of the document. Since *supplicationes* are found in other entries with-

* This article was written at the instigation and with the constant encouragement of Professor Rostovtzeff. I wish also to acknowledge gratefully the interest and advice of Professor N. H. Baynes, Professor A. D. Nock, Professor H. M. Last, Dr. Cyril Bailey, Mr. C. G. Stone and Mr. H. M. D. Parker.

[1] The two entries are lines 8 and 14 of col. II. Mention of the *Feriale Duranum* (D. P. 2) was made in the Fifth Dura Report (The Excavations at Dura-Europos, Prelim. Rep. of Fifth Season of Work (Oct. 1931–Mar. 1932), ed. M. I. Rostovtzeff, 1934, p. 295 f., and a small portion of it including line 14 reproduced (Pl. XXXI, 2)). Its contents have been outlined by Professor Rostovtzeff in Münchener Beiträge z. Papyrusforschung, XIX (1934), pp. 364-7; and in Comptes-rendus de l'Acad. des Inscr. et Belles-lettres, 1933, p. 312 f. It will be published in full in Yale Classical Studies in 1937 under Professor Rostovtzeff's editorship by R. O. Fink, W. F. Snyder and myself.

out mention of the deities or divine powers to which they were to be offered, the construction would not make the two entries peculiar in this respect.

The name *rosaliae* is an addition to the already numerous Latin designations of rose festivals — *rosalia*, *rosaria*, *rosae*, *rosa*, *dies rosae*, *dies rosationis*. The Greek names for rose-festivals show just as much variety, the ῥοδισμός, ῥόδα and ἡμέρα τῶν ῥόδων of Roman times being supplemented by ῥουσάλια, ῥοσσάλια and ῥοδιακά in Byzantine Greek. The form of the word, however, inevitably raises a doubt as to whether it is a possible Latin festival-name. That "rosalias" is a mere dittography due to anticipation of the "s" of "signorum" would seem unlikely, since the form occurs twice in a document carefully written in rustic capitals. Since "ob," however, throughout the rest of the document is always followed by the name of a festival or occasion to be celebrated, e.g., "ob natalem," "ob imperium," "ob uestalia," "ob diem quinquatriorum," it seems that the name of the festival must actually be *rosaliae signorum*.[2]

In a document of such a manifestly military character, which has, moreover, for its provenance the military archives of a garrison town, the word *signa* can only refer to the *signa militaria*, the standards of the Roman army. This context definitely precludes a reference to *signa deorum*. The festival then obviously has some sort of connexion with the army's cult of these military standards. Its cult acts indeed can be paralleled even from our scanty evidence relating to this cult, though the festival itself cannot. In military religious life this cult played a part of first-rate importance, even if it was not actually the religion κατ' ἐξοχήν of the army, as the early Christian apologists made out.[3] Consequently in all military ceremonies the *signa* had a

[2] The question is not vital for interpreting the significance of the celebration. Even if the word *rosaliae* referred, for instance, to the actual decorations, the considerations which follow would not be invalidated, for in any case a decking of the *signa* with roses is clearly implied, and what is of interest is still to determine the reason for this act.

[3] Tertull., Apol., 16; idem., ad nat., I, 12 (ad. fin.); Minuc. Felix, 29, 7. Their eagerness to demonstrate that all unwittingly the Roman soldiers had been worshipping the cross may well have led to some exaggeration of the cult's importance. The evidence relating to the cult of the *signa* has been collected by A. von Domaszewski, Die Religion des römischen Heeres (Westd. Zeitschr., XIV, 1 (1895)), p. 12 f.; Ch. Renel,

prominent place and part; [4] at all sacrifices, ordinary and extraordinary, they were brought by the *signiferi* near to the altar; [5] and sometimes it was as the actual recipients of the sacrifice that they were there. This is difficult to determine from the monuments, and even the dedications of altars to *signa* and *aquilae* [6] might be purely honorific. The literary evidence, however, attests the performance of sacrifices, [7] among which would naturally be included libations [8] and *supplicationes ture ac vino* of the later type. [9]

Among other cult acts performed in honour of the *signa* parallels can be found for the *rosaliae*, which is evidently the decoration of the *signa* with *coronae* of roses or with *rosae solutae*. It was probably cult acts such as this [10] that were provided for by the soldiers' contribution of four drachmae each "[ad] signa" mentioned in the accounts of an Egyptian legion. [11] The representation on the *signa* in gold and silver of the wreaths awarded

---

Cultes militaires de Rome: les enseignes, Lyon, 1903; W. Kubitschek in Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. *signa*, cols. 2342–4; H. Kruse, Studien zur offiziellen Geltung des Kaiserbildes im röm. Kaiserreiche, Paderborn, 1934.

[4] Cf. such scenes on the Column of Trajan or of Marcus Aurelius, and Renel, op. cit., pp. 297–306.

[5] Cf. e.g. Cichorius, Die Reliefs der Traiansäule, Pls. LXII, LXIII, LXXXV, and (from Dura itself) Cumont, Fouilles de Doura-Europos (1926), Atlas, Pl. L, and Dura Report V, Pl. XXXVI, 3.

[6] CIL, III, 6224, 7591 (= Dessau, 2295); VII, 1030 f.

[7] Josephus, B. J., 6, 6, *κομίσαντες τὰς σημαίας εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν . . . ἔθυσαν αὐταῖς αὐτόθι.* Herodian IV, 4, 5, *ὡς δὲ εἰσέπεσεν* (sc. Caracalla) *ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον ἔς τε τὸν νεών, ἔνθα τὰ σημεῖα καὶ τὰ ἀγάλματα τοῦ στρατοπέδου προσκυνεῖται, ῥίψας ἑαυτὸν ἐς γῆν ὡμολόγει τε χαριστήρια ἔθνέ τε σωτήρια.* Here the sacrifice is to the "imagines" (*τὰ ἀγάλματα*) as well, and in general the two cannot be separated (cf. Kruse, op. cit., p. 56). They are usually represented together, were present together at all ceremonies and are considered together as divine recipients of sacrifice. Hence they are probably to be understood as included with the *signa* in the *rosaliae signorum*.

[8] Cf. e.g. an early IIIrd century tombstone from Ramleh by Alexandria, near the headquarters of the imperial army in Egypt (Comptes-rendus de l'Acad. des Inscr. et Belles-lettres, 1872, p. 208 ff.).

[9] For this later type of *supplicatio* cf. Wissowa in Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. *supplicationes*, cols. 949–51. Some of the *supplicationes* represented on Trajan's column, for example, may well be to the *signa* grouped by the altar.

[10] Cf. the anointing of *aquilae* and *signa* on festival days (Pliny, N. H., XIII, 23).

[11] Pap. Genav. lat. 1, l. 9 (von Premerstein, Klio, III (1903), p. 12). Cf., however, the interpretation of Cagnat, L'armée rom. d'Afrique, p. 390, n. 4.

as *dona militaria* to a legion or a cohort is doubtless the outcome of a custom of adorning them with real wreaths on special occasions. At the lustrations of the army and of the camp, for example, they were probably crowned; [12] on beginning a campaign or on setting out in an important crisis it seems to have been customary for the soldiers to decorate them; [13] and indeed on all joyful occasions, especially, as we shall see, after victories, the probability is that a *coronatio signorum* of some kind took place. Many of the crowns used were undoubtedly of flowers, and in a late instance they are specifically mentioned. On the occasion of the marriage of Honorius in A.D. 398 the *signa* are referred to as bright with flowers.[14]

Similar cult acts to those of our two entries can thus be found among those known to have been performed to the *signa*. But from this after all little can be safely concluded. It certainly provides no proof that the *rosaliae signorum* are festivals in the festival-cycle of the *signa* cult. For while some of these cult acts to be sure took place on the regular calendar celebrations devoted wholly to the cult of the *signa* themselves, others just as certainly were performed to them incidentally, at festivals with which they had not this special connexion. Knowing as little as we do of the cult of the *signa*, we are quite at a loss to distinguish between the two classes of celebration on the basis of the cult acts performed to the *signa*. The question must be decided with the aid of other considerations.

But first it is well to point out just what is involved in this question. On whether the festivals have this more intimate type of connexion with the cult of the *signa* or not depend two widely different interpretations of their nature. The existence of the connexion would mean that their *raison d'être* was to commemorate something connected with the *signa*, just as the *natalis signorum*, for example, did, and that the rites mentioned in these

[12] Plut., Marcell., 22: ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς καθαρμοῖς τῶν στρατοπέδων εἰώθεσαν, δάφνῃ πολλῇ καταστέψαντες τὰ ὅπλα καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας. If the lustration of the arms implied their crowning, so doubtless did that of the *signa* (for a lustration of the *signa*, cf. Suet., Vitell., 9).

[13] Suet., Claud., 13. The decorations missing from the "incompta signa" of the Annals (III, 2, 2) and the "inhonora signa" of the Histories (IV, 62, 4) are probably, however, the *dona militaria*.

[14] Claudian, X, 186–8.

entries were the cult acts of festivals which were in fact some such commemoration. That some of these rites took the form of decoration with roses would be of purely subordinate importance. On the other hand, there is the possibility that the festivals were essentially rose festivals, celebrated for the same reasons as other rose festivals of the period. In that case there would be no intimate connexion with the cult of the *signa*, which would merely have importance as being objects of the cult act by which rose festivals were normally celebrated — decoration with roses. The singling out of the *signa* for this honour would be sufficiently explained by their importance in the life of the army.

That this second interpretation is to be preferred will be seen later. But the arguments for the first are important enough to call for statement and refutation. In the first place explicit mention of the *signa* obviously confers on them a special emphasis. Without this mention it would have been understood that they had their part in the festival, as they normally had in all military celebrations. That they actually appear in so brief an entry must imply that, important as they were on all *dies festi*, they were especially so on these two. Moreover, if the *supplicatio* is to them, as will be maintained later, their importance is thereby further enhanced.

Again, precise dates suggest anniversaries, and such anniversaries of events connected with the *signa* were celebrated, as we know, the principal one being the birthday of the legion, known as "natalis legionis," "natalis aquilae" or "natalis signorum." [15] More likely, however, as an explanation of our festivals would be the commemoration of victories won by the legions, vexillations from which formed part of the Dura garrison.[16] Celebrations of victories are prescribed already in this document,[17] but it is not inconceivable that others also might

[15] CIL, II, 2552 (= Dessau, 9125), 2553 (= Dessau, 9127) (*natale signor(um)*), 2554–6 (now proved genuine by Ann. Épig., 1910, nos. 3–6), 6183 (= Dessau, 2293); von Domaszewski, op. cit., pp. 12, 20.

[16] For these vexillations cf. M. Rostovtzeff, Münchener Beiträge z. Papyrusforschung, XIX (1934), p. 357 f.; idem, Comptes-rendus de l'Acad. des Inscr. et Belles-lettres, 1933, p. 310 f.

[17] Cf. infra n. 27.

be commemorated in the form of rose festivals. For the cult of *Victoria*,[18] by this time at the height of its popularity, had naturally found special favour in the camps.[19] And one aspect of its development had been an increase in the attention paid to particular victories.[20]

For a victory celebration the *coronatio* of the *signa* would obviously have been a very fitting ceremony.[21] Not only are the army's gods (and also in the IIIrd century the emperor) frequently represented being crowned by Victory,[22] but the type of Victory crowning trophies, *aquilae* or *signa* is common on coins and elsewhere.[23] Moreover, at the celebration immediately following a victory in the field the general and his *fasces*, the soldiers themselves and their weapons, and doubtless the *signa*, were crowned.[24] That these *coronae* were of flowers as well as of laurel appears from the evidence.[25]

[18] On this cult cf. esp. J. Gagé, Rev. hist., 171 (1933), p. 1 ff.

[19] v. Domaszewski, op. cit., pp. 37–40.

[20] Roschers Lexikon, s.v. *victoria* (Latte), col. 299 f.

[21] For the crown as the common symbol of victory, cf. L. Deubner, ARW, XXX (1933), p. 80 f.

[22] E.g. Iupiter Dolichenus, Haas, Bilderatlas, 9–11. Lief., 119, 122. To Mithra too as *invictus* belonged the crown (Cumont, Textes et Monuments rel. aux mystères de Mithra, I, p. 319 and n. 2).

[23] Victory crowning trophies is very common and crowning the *aquila* relatively so. For Victory crowning the *signa*, cf. e.g. Cohen², t. I, Titus 380, Domitien 635; the *signa* already crowned, t. II, Dide Julien, 1 ff. The legionary eagle with a *corona* in its beak, not always eschatological in significance, is a common motif. For Dura cf. Report V, Pl. XXXVI, 3, and many other examples. On the top of a shield from Dura is represented an *aquila* being crowned by two Victories (cf. Rostovtzeff, Città Carovaniere, 1934, p. 163), to be published by F. E. Brown in Report VI, ch. XIII. The *coronatio* of statues is very often represented in Duran art, cf. Dura Rep. V, Pl. XIV; Yale Classical Studies, V (1935), fig. 50; by Victories, Dura Rep. II, Frontispiece and Pl. I, 1; Dura Rep. V, Pl. XXXVI, 2, 3. A graffito from the wall of a house (Block L 5, 32), to be published by F. E. Brown in Dura Rep. VII, may actually be a crude rendering of the *coronatio* of a *vexillum* at the *rosaliae signorum*. On the only complete *vexillum* extant (Rostovtzeff, Monuments of the Egyptian section of the Museum of Alexander III in Moscow, vol. III, Plate, (in Russian)) is painted a victory standing on a globe holding in her left hand a palm branch and in her right a *corona*.

[24] Valerius Maximus, I, 8, 6; Plutarch, Marius, 22, Sert., 22, 2, Pomp., 31, 2 f., Paul. Aemil., 22, 1 (tents crowned); Pliny, N. H., XV, 133 f. (cf. XXXV, 201).

[25] Cf. the portent received by Sulla's army (Plut., Sulla, 27, 7). The encouragement of the men was obviously due to their feeling already crowned as after a victory. Tac., Hist., II, 70: "pars viae quam Cremonenses *lauru rosaque* constraverant" (to greet the victorious Vitellius). Cf. the use of flowers at triumphs, Ovid, Tristia, IV, 2, 20.

But, plausible as is this interpretation of the festival, there are decisive arguments against it. In the first place, victories were not in this period anonymous. They were no sooner won than they were distinguished by an ethnic or geographic epithet.[26] Had it been victories that the garrison was celebrating, they would almost certainly have been specified in this way, as they are specified in the entry in col. I.[27] Even stronger perhaps is the objection that in these entries the credit for the victories would be given to the *signa* only. This would be an impossible infringement of the emperor's rights and privileges. That victories in war were his and his alone was not only a corollary of the nature of his *imperium*, an *imperium* superior to all others, from which derived the *auspicia* of all the armies;[28] it was besides implied in the almost religious faith in the *Victoria Augusti* as the sole source of victory.[29] Such a monopoly of victories established both by legal and by quasi-divine right could not be impugned. To the emperor and his *Victoria*, not to the legion and its *signa*, must go this glory.[30]

If then, as would seem to be the case, the connexion with the *signa* fails to supply the reason for the celebration, the connexion must be regarded as incidental. And in the character of the festival as a rose-festival must be sought the reason. The very resemblance of the name *rosaliae* to *rosalia* is enough to suggest that we have not to deal with a mere cult-act, decoration with roses, which might take place on *any* occasion, but rather with some form of a festival already known from other sources as having special characteristics and a significance of its own. It is unlikely, to say the least of it, that these two rose-festivals, celebrated at a time of the year when the inhabitants

[26] Cf. supra n. 20.

[27] Lines 14–16:

"V k[a]l [feb]rarias ob u[ic]tori[as arabicam et adiabenicam et parthica]m maxi
m[a]m diui seu[e]r̤[i e]t ob [imperium diui traiani uictoriae part]hic[a]e
b'[f' d]iuo traian[o b' m'."

There can be no doubt that the names of victories are to be restored.

[28] Cf. Gagé, Rev. arch., XXXII (1930), p. 1 ff.

[29] Cf. Gagé, Rev. hist., 171 (1933), p. 1 ff.

[30] There are, it is true, two examples of dedications to the *Victoria* of a legion (CIL, VII, 217 and CIL, III, 11082). Even in the latter, however, the *Victoria* of the emperors comes first — "victoriae Augg. nn. et leg. I Adi. p. f. Antoninianae."

of many other parts of the Empire were likewise celebrating rose-festivals, should have no connexion in significance with these latter, but take place for quite different reasons. Much more natural is it to expect that the *rosaliae* of the standards should have some relation to the other types of *rosalia* for which there is evidence. The key to their interpretation will lie in discovering the nature of that relation.

But even if the *signa* were decorated with roses simply because it was the occasion of the festival of the *rosaliae*, we are still left with two possible interpretations of that festival's significance. For there were two kinds of *rosalia* celebrated by the Romans — those connected with the cult of the dead, and those the only aim of which was by banqueting and merrymaking to fête the welcome return of spring and summer.[31] Are the *rosaliae signorum* then celebrations in the cult of dead *commilitones* or occasions for the expression of joy in the yearly resurrection of the earth? [32] Both suggestions call for examination.

The use of flowers in the cult of the dead among the Greeks and Romans is abundantly attested by literary, epigraphical and archaeological evidence.[33] Among the flowers used roses enjoyed such favour that they gave rise to a special festival. Numerous inscriptions prescribe the celebration of these so-called *rosalia* or *rosaria* at the graves in the spring of every year.[34] It would not seem strange that the Dura garrison, like

[31] For *rosalia* in general cf. Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. *rosalia* (M. P. Nilsson), and besides the works quoted there (col. 1115), M. P. Nilsson, Beiträge zur Religionswiss. (Stockholm), II (1917), p. 134 ff.; Laum, Stiftungen in der gr. und röm. Antike, Leipzig und Berlin, 1914, I, pp. 85–7; Picard et Avezou, B. C. H., 38 (1914), p. 47 ff.; P. Collart, B. C. H., 55 (1931), p. 58 ff.; idem, B. C. H., 54 (1930), p. 376 ff., but on this inscription cf. J. Carcopino, in the volume In memoriam Lui Vasile Pârvan, Bucharest, 1934, p. 77 ff. The latter has remarks on *rosalia* in general, ibid., pp. 90–2.

[32] Cf. M. Rostovtzeff, Münchener Beiträge, XIX (1934), p. 366. This paper was already written when I read the remarks of Professor Carcopino, in the course of which (op. cit., p. 91, n. 1) he expresses the view that the *rosaliae signorum* had no funerary connexion.

[33] Cf. e.g. the collections of literary evidence by Laum, op. cit., p. 83, n. 2; Frazer in Ovid's Fasti, vol. II, pp. 433 f., 437; Cook, J. H. S., XX (1900), pp. 11–13; Perdrizet, B. C. H., XXIV (1900), pp. 299–301. Special books on the rose are quoted in n. 49. The epigraphical and archaeological evidence is too common to make it worth while to collect it.

[34] Examples are Dessau, 6711, 7258, 7267, 8342, 8366, 8369–8374. Collections will also be found in Laum, op. cit., I, 85–6 (with references to II), Pauly-Wissowa, s.v.

the groups of relatives and friends in these inscriptions, should have carried out rites for the propitiation and cheering of its dead at the *rosaliae signorum*, decorating its *signa* as the others decorated tomb or statue.

There is reason to suppose the existence of official military cults of the fallen. Such a cult, for instance, finding expression in an annual ceremony, was instituted by Trajan in A.D. 101 after the battle at Tapae against the Dacians; [35] and similar cults may well have been carried out at the Adam-Klissi monument in the Dobrudja [36] and at other such memorials.[37] It is known, moreover, that every legion had its *Begräbniskasse*.[38] Why not also its own cult of its dead administered in connexion with this?

The question is whether such celebrations in the cult of the dead could have taken the form of the popular *rosalia*. The possibility, it seems, must be denied. For of all the numerous *rosalia* known to us none is celebrated in honour of a large number of persons. All are banquets to which the dead also are invited — but these extra guests never number more than one or two.[39] In this respect the *rosaliae signorum*, if they were festi-

---

rosalia, and Waltzing, Étude historique sur les corporations professionelles chez les Romains, IV, p. 541. These inscriptions are especially numerous in Northern Italy, in the Danubian and Balkan lands and in Asia Minor. The celebration took the form of a banquet at which roses were strewn on the grave and distributed to the guests. The dead man's statue (CIL, V, 5907, 5272) or the grave-herm (CIL, V, 5878) was sometimes decorated with them.

[35] Cassius Dio, LXVIII, 8, 2 (ed. Boissevain); Cichorius, die Reliefs der Traiansäule, Pl. XCI. His interpretation (op. cit., III, p. 99 f.) of this scene as the performance by Trajan of the above-mentioned sacrifice to the dead on the first anniversary of the battle is generally accepted (cf. B. Götze, Jhb. d. arch. Inst., 50 (1935), Arch. Anz., 348).

[36] On this monument (distinct from the *Tropaeum Traiani* at the same place) cf. Studniczka, Abh. d. sächs. Ges. d. Wiss., 1904, Abh. IV, p. 9 ff. (with bibliography).

[37] Furtwängler (Abh. d. bayr. Akad., I. Cl., XXII (1903), p. 473) mentions several.

[38] Vegetius, Ep. rei mil. II, 20; Cagnat, L'armée rom. d'Afrique, I, pp. 390–2.

[39] It is at least possible, however, that some *collegia* celebrated *rosalia* for all their dead. Of such a kind may have been the rose-festival of the *Collegium Aesculapi et Hygiae* (CIL, VI, 2, 10234 = Bruns, Fontes[7], p. 391, no. 176, l. 15 f.), though there can be no certainty that it had any connexion with the cult of the dead. The rose festival of the *Collegium Silvani* (CIL, X, 444 = Bruns, Fontes[7], p. 398, no. 180, l. 11 ff.) apparently did not, since the same proceedings are prescribed for a number of other festival days which had no such connexion. Ῥοδισμοί were celebrated by the Pergamene college of ὑμνῳδοί (Fraenkel, Inschr. v. Perg., II, no. 374, B 8 f., C 6 f., D 8 f.). These were

vals of the dead, would resemble none of the other *rosalia* of this type known.

But a careful consideration of the two entries suffices to show that the *rosaliae signorum* can have no such connexion with the cult of the dead. For forms of celebration are prescribed for them which are incompatible with the beliefs and practices of that cult. For instance, the celebration centred round the *signa*, which were divine powers, the *numina* of the legions. But on the festival days of the dead the gods other than those of the under-world were kept away and their temples closed.[40]

Moreover, the cult act is a *supplicatio*. Even at this late period when the *supplicatio* has changed from a festival into a mere cult act without fixed reference to any particular cult,[41] its use in the cult of the dead is not admissible. Though it was now commonly offered to the *divi*, as the *Feriale Duranum* shows, it could still hardly have outgrown the associations it had in Cicero's day [42] to the extent of being offered to the unapotheosized dead. It is not conceivable that the cult of the dead could thus take over cult acts from the cult of the immortal gods.

It might be held that the *supplicatio* was performed rather *in memoriam mortuorum*.[43] True it is that the *rosalia*, being joyful reunions with the dead at which their shadowy lives were cheered by the gifts of roses,[44] had as their aim commemoration at least as much as propitiation. But it is of the essence of the *supplicatio*, an act of worship, that it should be addressed to some recipient. Moreover, it is at the least very doubtful if it was a ceremony of this purely commemorative character that

---

probably celebrations in the cult of the dead (cf. B 21 f. — provision of incense for *οἱ ἀναπαυόμενοι*, and Fraenkel, op. cit., p. 265 f.; Poland, Gr. Vereinswesen, p. 513).

[40] Ovid, Fasti, II, 563 (Feralia); V, 485 f. (Lemuria).

[41] Cf. n. 9. I hope to treat of this change and its significance elsewhere.

[42] Phil., I, 6, 13; II, 43, 110.

[43] Cf. the libation in Apul., Met., IV, 22, "poculis aureis memoriae defunctorum commilitonum vino mero libant."

[44] Cf. esp. an inscription from Bulgaria (Seyrig, Rev. de l'hist. des relig., XCIV (1928), pp. 275–7):

ἐν δὲ ῥόδοισι [ῥ]όδον ἐπιχεύσατε
τῷ περιβώμῳ . . . .
ὁ βίος ἔνθα τότε μ' ὁρῶντα αὔξει ὡς τὸ πρότερον.

the army would have held for its dead. In the clearest evidence regarding its official Totenkult [45] the word ἐναγίζειν implies a ceremony of quite a different kind.

This explanation of the *rosaliae signorum* as celebrations for the military dead cannot stand. What then of the second type of rose festival? Can the rose festivals of the standards be convincingly interpreted as joyous seasonal carnivals? At once it becomes apparent that they have an important characteristic in common with the other festivals of this type. Whereas the *rosalia* of the dead remained throughout private festivals celebrated by small groups on dates fixed in the dead man's bequest or by themselves, *rosalia* as a spring festival of rejoicing are known to have acquired the standing of *feriae stativae* for public celebration. As such they have a place in the later *fasti publici* — in the calendar of Philocalus on May 23,[46] in the officially prescribed *Feriale Capuanum* on May 13.[47] At the latest then by the middle of the IVth century *rosalia* of this type had become accepted among the official festivals of the Roman people. This fact alone affords one not unimportant reason for assigning to this class the *rosaliae signorum*, occurring as they do in an official calendar, which is itself essentially an abbreviated version of the *fasti publici*.

It is probably due to chance that most of our evidence preserved from the first three centuries of the Empire is for *rosalia* as festivals of the dead and festivals of the *collegia*.[48] If the *fasti publici* of the IInd and IIIrd centuries were extant, *rosalia* as flower festivals of spring might well be found already among the state *feriae*. For the festivals of this type in the IVth century calendars are good examples of what was the most popular use of roses in the ancient world, especially among the Romans — as an accompaniment of both public and private rejoicing.

Their connexion with banquets, for instance, is a familiar

[45] Cf. supra n. 35.

[46] CIL, I, 1^2, p. 264, "macellus [*sic*] rosa(s) sumat."

[47] Dessau, 4918, l. 7, "III Idus Mai. rosaria ampiteatri." The official character of this select list of festivals for Campania is stressed, cf. l. 1 "feriale domnorum" (i.e. Valentian II and Theodosius) and l. 12 "iussione domnorum." On this document cf. Mommsen, Ges. Schr., VIII, pp. 14–24.

[48] Nilsson in Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. *rosalia*, col. 1114.

one.[49] The growth of luxury during the Empire brought extravagance in this as well as in the other uses of roses in private life.[50] That the mania for them was far from dying out by the IIIrd century is plain from the Historia Augusta.[51] Similarly, at public rejoicings and celebrations the rose played a great part. The entry of distinguished persons into a city,[52] public processions,[53] and the receipt of good news [54] were all marked by the wearing and scattering of flowers, including of course roses, which were regarded as among the best flowers for *coronae*.

Among these celebrations with roses which have nothing to do with the cult of the dead a special group is formed by the spring and early summer festivals. The rose of all flowers was regarded as having a peculiar connexion with spring.[55] Not only is this celebrated by the poets, but in the representations of Spring in

[49] The banquet is the time "cum regnat rosa" (Mart., Ep., X, 19, 21). Numerous examples of the ancient use of roses in this and many other connexions will be found in M. J. Schleiden, Die Rose, Geschichte und Symbolik in ethnographischer und kulturhistorischer Beziehung, Leipzig, 1873, chs. II and III, and in C. Joret, La rose dans l'antiquité et au moyen âge, Paris, 1892, chs. II and III.

[50] Cf. Athen., IV, 29, 147 f. (Cleopatra's banquet for Antony in Cilicia); Suet., Nero, 27.

[51] vit. Hel., 19, 7; vit. Gall., 16, 2; vit. Car., 18, 4.

[52] E.g. Plut., Pomp., 57; Herodian, I, 7, 3 and 6 (Commodus' entry into Rome); Cassius Dio, LXXV, 1, 4 (ed. Boissevain) (Septimius Severus' entry into Rome); Herodian, IV, 8, 8 (Caracalla's entry into Alexandria).

[53] E.g. Lucr., II, 624–8 and Ovid, Fasti, IV, 346 (Magna Mater); Herodian, V, 6, 8 (procession of Elagabal's Syrian god).

[54] E.g. Tac., Hist., II, 55; cf. Tertull., De cor., 13, "coronatur et vulgus nunc ex principalium prosperitatum exultatione."

[55] Cf. Cic., Verr., II, 5, 11, 27, "cum rosam viderat, tum incipere ver arbitrabatur." In dealing with these *rosalia*, no attempt has been made to draw a rigid distinction between spring and summer. The Greeks often did not make a distinction at all (A. D. Nock, Gnomon, June 1934, p. 290 f.), and among Latin writers there was no agreement as to the exact date of the beginning of summer (cf. Frazer on Ovid's Fasti, V, 600, vol. IV, p. 72 f.). Our first festival coincides with the date given by Varro (R. R., I, 28) and Pliny (N. H., XVIII, 222), viz. May 9. Ovid (l.c.) dates it May 13, which is the date of the rose festival in the *Feriale Capuanum*. These coincidences are in all probability accidental, but it is possible that the *rosalia* were to some extent bound up with the transition from spring to summer, just as the Brumalia (cf. p. 29) were with that from autumn to winter. Although some rose-festivals were held later than this, they can all for our purposes legitimately be classed with spring festivals, since both celebrate the same general change — the reappearance of foliage and flowers.

art her invariable attribute is a *corona* or basket of roses.[56] The rose then being the symbol of spring *par excellence*, it was natural not only that its own festival, the *rosalia*, should commemorate spring's annual return, but that it should also play a significant part in the celebrations of the other numerous spring festivals of this period. Both in the typically Roman festivals of this kind[57] and in the very popular[58] spring celebrations of the Oriental cults[59] it had an important place. That these festivals were not without actual influence on the development of the *rosalia* is very possible.[60] At all events when so much enthusiasm for spring festivals connected with roses is known to have existed at the time, it is easy to understand why one more such festival should grow popular enough to be given a place in the public calendar.

But if the *rosalia* have much in common with these other

[56] For some provincial representations cf. s.vv. *Mois*, *Saisons*, the indices to Inventaire des mosaïques de la Gaule etc., and the General Index (vol. X) to Espérandieu, Recueil général des bas-reliefs etc. A good example in a mosaic is Rostovtzeff, Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire, Pl. XLIII, 1. Cf. collection by Stengel in Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. Horai, col. 2311 ff. and Rapp in Roschers Lexikon, I, 2730–8. Cf. also the representations of the Fasti Philocaliani, Strzygowski, Jhb. d. arch. I., I. Ergänzungsh. (1888), pp. 67–9, with Pl. XXIII, and a Greek epigram on the Roman months (A.P. IX, 580, l. 4) in which May says εἰμὶ ῥόδων γενέτης.

[57] Roses at the Floralia, Philost., Ep. 55, p. 360 K; cf. Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. Floralia, col. 2750; at the spring festivals of Venus — after the sacred *lavatio* on April 1 (Ovid, Fasti, IV, 138), and at the Vinalia priora on April 23 (Ovid, Fasti, IV, 869 f.); at the May festivals of Dea Dia celebrated by the *Fratres Arvales*, Henzen, Acta Fratrum Arvalium, pp. 13, 27 (distributed among *fratres* after banquets), p. 36 (worn by *magister* for the *ludi circenses* of the second day), p. 27 (the goddess herself crowned, probably with roses).

[58] The spring festival-cycle of Magna Mater and Attis took up a greater section of the calendar than the festivals of any other god throughout the year (H. Graillot, Bibl. Écoles fr. d'Athènes et de Rome, CVII, Paris, 1912, p. 141).

[59] Rose in procession of Magna Mater, Lucr., II, 627 f.; at the *navigium Isidis*, Apul., Met., XI, 6, 9, 12; the rose and Bacchus, Daremberg et Saglio, s.v. Bacchus, p. 623, col. 2. The rose may even have been one of the sacred plants of Mithras, Cumont, Textes et Monuments, II, no. 246 (b) (Pl. VI), and remarks in I, p. 194 and n. 6, 195, 205 and n. 4.

[60] They certainly had an effect on Roman public and private religion (cf. in general Jullian in Daremberg et Saglio, s.v. *feriae*, p. 1062, col. 1). It was probably, for instance, the rites of the first day of the Magna Mater spring festival, the mourning for Attis ("XI Kal. Apr. Arbor intrat," CIL, I, 1^2, p. 260), which gave rise to the celebration of the *dies violae* or *dies violaris* at graves by those who were not devotees of the goddess (Graillot, op. cit., p. 145 and n. 5).

spring festivals, from those of the Oriental cults at any rate they differ in one fundamental respect. Those cults, in origin nature religions,[61] always preserved through their myths of the death and resurrection of a god the most intimate relation with the disappearance and return of vegetation. The *rosalia* were connected with the revival of the earth's life in a very different sense. Mainly festivals of city-folk, they always had a certain artificial character.[62] In their celebrants the blooming of flowers gave rise to no religious ecstasy as at the resurrection of a god: it was for them little more than an excuse for merry making. They but followed the advice that runs through so much of ancient poetry — to learn a lesson from the evanescence of the rose and gather rosebuds while we may.

Celebrations of this carnival type enjoyed a growing favour throughout the Empire. Festivals such as the Floralia,[63] the Quinquatrus, the Saturnalia, the Compitalia, the Kalendae Ianuariae, which offered to the common people a maximum of amusement, often of a licentious character, found a steady increase not only in popularity but in the importance assigned to them in the public calendar.[64] It was such popular festivals as these that were most likely to have a place in the army's religious calendar, as the *Feriale Duranum* has made clear. Of the Saturnalia,[65] for instance, it is well known that the soldiers had their own celebration, while the *Feriale Duranum* itself reveals that the Quinquatria was officially celebrated in the camps as a five-day festival.[66] The fact that the Floralia does not appear

[61] Pettazoni, I misteri, Bologna, 1923, p. 283.

[62] Nilsson calls them "ein ganz profanes Frühlingsgelage, das dem sentimentalen Naturgefühl einer überkultivierten Zeit entsprungen ist" (Beiträge zur Religionswiss., II (1917), p. 134).

[63] The Floralia even spread to the *municipia* of Italy and to the provinces, cf. Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. Floralia (Wissowa), col. 2751. It is to be noticed, however, that the *ludi Florales* lost two days in the course of the Empire (Pauly-Wissowa, Suppl. V, col. 625).

[64] Wissowa, op. cit., p. 442. On the growth of the Kalendae cf. M. P. Nilsson, ARW, XIX, (1918), esp. pp. 51–4. It did not attain its greatest popularity until the IVth century. With it by then had become merged the Compitalia (ibid., p. 55).

[65] Wissowa, op. cit., p. 207, n. 8; von Premerstein, Klio III (1903), p. 11 f.

[66] Col. II, l. 1, "XIIII Kal. apriles ob diem quinq[u]a[triorum] suppli[c]atio in X ka[l. easdem."

in that *feriale* makes even more likely the interpretation of the *rosaliae signorum* proposed. These two rose-festivals would be in a sense the soldiers' substitute for the Floralia of the civil population.

The *rosalia*, however, were not mere carnivals: they were carnivals connected with a season. This type of celebration was popular in the IVth century, the ancient festivals of the seasons having long been emptied of most of their religious content,[67] just as the Horai had degenerated into mere personifications of the seasons.[68] Of the seven festivals in the *Feriale Capuanum* (A.D. 387) four are of the seasons, including the *rosalia*; [69] and contemporary pagan celebrations of this kind are referred to by St. Ambrose.[70] But earlier times provide a quite close parallel in nature and development to the *rosalia*— the Brumalia.[71] The first evidence for it is in a list of popular festivals in Tertullian's *De Idololatria*,[72] mentions of the Saturnalia in the same list showing that at this time they were still distinct; later the Brumalia absorbed the Saturnalia.[73] It was looked on as marking the end of autumn and the beginning of winter, just as the *rosalia* were connected with the general transition from winter to summer, or possibly even with the particular one from

[67] For an interesting example (from Thessaly) of a spring festival which had become a mere carnival, cf. D. S. Robertson, J. H. S., XXXIX (1919), pp. 110–15 (on Apul., Met., II, 31–III, 18), and for the origin of the modern carnival in nature rites, C. Clemen, ARW, XVII (1914), p. 139 ff.

[68] Stengel in Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. Horai, col. 2304. The large number of representations of these personifications in the art of the Empire (cf. supra note 56) is an illustration of the growth of interest in commemorating the seasons.

[69] Dessau, 4918: "lustratio ad flumen Casilino" (May 1) (festival of the standing crops), "rosaria ampiteatri" (May 13), "lustratio ad flumen ad iter Dianae" (July 25) (harvest-festival), "Vendemia Acerusae" (Oct. 15) (vintage-festival).

[70] Migne, PL., XVII, col. 360 f. *In epist. ad Galat.* IV, 10 ("dies observatis et menses et tempora et annos"): "tempora vero sunt ver, aestas, autumnus, hiems . . . Tempora vero sic observant, cum dicunt: Hodie veris initium est, festivitas est." That the Christian festivals of the Quatre-Temps are a survival of such celebrations has been demonstrated by Dom Morin, Rev. bénédictine, XIV (1897), p. 377 ff.

[71] On the Brumalia cf. Tomaschek, Sitzber. d. Wiener Akad. (Phil.-hist. Cl.), 60 (1868), p. 360 ff.; on the date, Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. *bruma*; E. Norden, Die Geburt des Kindes, p. 18, n. 4.

[72] The others are the Saturnalia, the Ianuariae and the Matronales. The *De idololatria* was written probably in the first decade of the IIIrd century A.D. (Schanz: Ges. d. röm. Lit., VIII, 3^3, 285).

[73] Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. Saturnalia (Nilsson), col. 210.

spring to summer.[74] Like the *rosalia*, it was officially recognized by the time of the *fasti Philocaliani*.[75] Both of them enjoyed great popularity in Byzantine times, and together with the Kalendae survived long after.[76]

But at the time of our document the *rosaliae signorum* had not yet quite degenerated into a mere carnival to celebrate a seasonal change. The performance of a *supplicatio* at the celebration definitely constitutes it a religious ceremony. Mommsen [77] pointed out that the *rosalia* and similar festivals were retained in the public calendar of the IVth century because, not calling for the performance of cult acts,[78] but consisting merely of general merrymaking, they could not offend on account of specific pagan religious import; they could even be encouraged as mere "festi conventus civium." [79] It follows that in these entries *rosalia* of this type appear not merely at an earlier period than in any other evidence, but at an earlier stage of their development, a stage when they still had a religious content.

To define this religious content would be difficult indeed. Here it must suffice to determine in whose honour the *supplicatio* was performed. First, however, the exact part played in the celebration by the *signa* must be established; for it was merely pointed out above that the festival was not *in essence* a festival of the *signa*. Our festival-name, "rosaliae signorum," is in respect of form an exact parallel to that of the *Feriale Capuanum* — "rosaria ampiteatri." [80] What the latter obviously means is that on the occasion of a rose-festival the amphitheatre was decorated with roses.[81] It would not be suggested

[74] Cf. supra n. 55.

[75] VIII Kal. Dec. Bruma (CIL, I, 1^2, p. 276). "Bruma" signifies here not the winter solstice, but the first day of the Brumalia.

[76] For the survival of *rosalia*, cf. Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. *rosalia*, col. 1114 f. Add H. Lammerhirt, Neue Heidelb. Jhbb., VIII (1898), p. 1 ff.; H. Murko, Wörter und Sachen, II (1910), pp. 142–154; Nilsson, Neue Jhbb. f. d. klass. Alt. XXVII (1911), p. 682; idem, Beiträge z. Rel.-wiss. (Stockholm), II (1917), p. 149 ff.

[77] Ges. Schr., VIII, pp. 21–4.

[78] Cf. Nilsson, Beiträge, l.c., p. 137, "In den Rosalien fehlen von Haus aus die der Christen anstössigen Kultzeremonien."

[79] Cod. Theod., XVI, 10, 4, l. 17 (A.D. 399).

[80] Dessau, 4918, l. 6 f.

[81] Cf. Tert., De Cor., 13: "ceterum a saeculo coronantur . . . et ludus et ipsa amphitheatra."

that the reason was to celebrate anything connected with the amphitheatre. It was chosen for decoration simply because, celebrations in temples being by that time forbidden, it was natural to choose one of the greatest centres of life in the city.[82] Similarly at Rome it was a place of outstanding importance in the life of the city's lower classes, the *macellum*, that was decorated on the occasion of the rose-festival.[83] For like reasons military authorities appointed the *signa* to be decorated. Such an assignment of prominence to them at the celebration merely typified the part they played throughout the religious and secular life of the garrison. For exactly the same reason on other festive occasions, e.g. at the celebration of Honorius' marriage,[84] they were decorated by the soldiers. Any great event in the life of the troops would normally be marked by the performance of some rite to the *signa*. What happened at Dura was probably this. On the occasion of any festival in our list there was held a parade of the troops forming the garrison. This would take place in the courtyard of the *praetorium*, or in the *praetorium* itself,[85] where the commander of the garrison probably harangued the soldiers. The *signa* would be brought out from the near-by *domus signorum* and grouped by the altar where the *supplicatio* was to be performed. On this occasion the festival was of such a kind that the main ceremony consisted in decking something with roses. What more natural choice than the *signa*, which, as we saw, it was customary to decorate on many other occasions? [86] And then what more natural name for the festival than *rosaliae signorum*?

[82] Doubtless also a show in it formed part of the celebration.

[83] CIL, I, 1^2, p. 264. For the *macella* at Rome, cf. Platner-Ashby, A Topographical Dict. of Ancient Rome, p. 332 f.; for those in towns of Italy and the provinces, Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. *macellum*, cols. 130–32 (K. Schneider). They were not exclusively meat-markets, but general provision markets (Pauly-Wissowa, l.c., col. 133). J. Carcopino (op. cit., p. 91) accordingly seems to give too restricted a significance to the rose festival of the *macellum* ("une fête corporative des bouchers, une liesse de quartier autour de leur *macellum*").

[84] Cf. supra n. 14.

[85] Dura Rep. V (1934), ed. M. Rostovtzeff, pp. 211–13.

[86] No doubt also the sacred objects in the *domus signorum* and possibly in other temples were crowned with them (cf. the στέψις τῶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ πάντων in the records of the Arsinoite temple of Iupiter Capitolinus, Wilcken, Grundzüge, Hist. Teil, Chrest., no. 96, p. III, l. 26–p. IV, l. 2; p. IV, ll. 8 f., 13 f., etc.). They were besides probably

But the *signa* were not merely the centre of camp life. They were divine powers, the *numina* of the legions. It would therefore be fitting that they should be made the very recipients of the cult act of this festival which was not by nature or tradition, so far as we know, consecrated to any particular god or gods. It was after all but an additional step in the making of these rose festivals, probably by now included in the civil public calendar, into an integral part of the army's religious life. Incidentally, if this explanation is correct, then the religious significance of the festival, whatever may have been its exact nature, was definitely subordinate and could easily have been lost by the IVth century.

This then and this only is the special emphasis on the *signa* which mention in this entry confers on them. The festival itself, primarily and essentially a rose festival, is one of the many such that were being celebrated in the Roman Empire at this season. The rose festival of the standards is not fundamentally different from the rose festivals of the amphitheatre or of the market.

It remains to explain the presence of two identical festivals of this type in so short a list. To assign them to two different legions — and there probably were at Dura in this period vexillations from two legions [87] — is to go against the natural conviction that the garrison must have combined for all celebrations. Moreover, a distinction would certainly have been made between the two sets of *signa*, had they belonged to different legions. The inclusion of the two festivals is rather simply a sign of the relaxed strictness of camp life. Two are there for better measure. If time could be found for a five-day celebration of the Quinquatria,[88] then two days for rose festivals does not seem inordinate, especially when no other spring flower festival was being celebrated. The Syrian army was notorious for softness and the love of luxurious living. The service itself

---

hung on the temple-walls (for this common custom at Dura, cf. Cumont, Fouilles de Doura-Europos, Atlas, Pls. L and LV, and text, p. 134), and the altar for the *supplicatio* decked with them. Every flower festival is characterized by a profusion of flowers (cf. Claudian, X, 295–7, "nec signifer ullus/nec miles pluviae flores dispergere ritu/ cessat. . . .").

[87] Cf. supra n. 16.

[88] Cf. supra n. 66.

was, compared with others, "opulenta quietaque," as Tacitus says,[89] and the proximity of some garrisons to large towns, such as Antioch, threw open to the soldiers all their elaborate resources for pleasure and vice. From other sources it is known that one of the *deliciae* in which they indulged was the use of flowers, indulged indeed to such excess that a remedy for the abuse had to be included in the reforms of Avidius Cassius.[90] With this popularity of flowers may be compared the spread of the use of unguents in the camps.[91] It is worth noticing that they too were associated with the *signa*, which were anointed on festival days [92] just as they were decorated with flowers. Even if Avidius Cassius' reforms were successful, the Eastern army's degenerate tastes doubtless had free play once more under Septimius Severus,[93] and the indulgent attitude of Caracalla was not likely to impose a check on them. By the time of Macrinus the Syrian legions were sadly out of training.[94] Elagabal was hardly one to restore discipline, and we know that in Severus Alexander's reign they were indulging to the full all their old "vices," the passion for flowers doubtless included.[95]

But our document is far from being a catalogue of all the celebrations of the camp. It is a list of select festivals prescribed for official celebration. The insertion of the two *rosaliae signorum* therefore bears the character of a concession from the

[89] Hist., II, 80.

[90] SHA., vit. Avid. Cass., 5, 11, "ille sane . . . omnes flores de capite collo et sinu militi excutiet." This letter of the prefect of Syria to Marcus Aurelius will hardly be genuine, but we may accept the evidence that the Syrian army was addicted to flowers.

[91] Cf. e.g., Suet., div. Iul., 67, "iactare solitus milites suos etiam unguentatos bene pugnare posse."

[92] Pliny, N. H., XIII, 23. Kruse (op. cit., p. 57, n. 3) is almost certainly wrong in holding that the anointing was merely for the purpose of cleaning the standards. That costly *unguenta* might have been wasted on dusty standards ("signa pulverulenta illa") for cult reasons is not so difficult to understand, but surely it is quite inconceivable that they could have been merely for purposes of cleaning. Moreover, the cleaning would have been done not on the *festi dies* themselves, but beforehand in preparation for them. The anointing was just as much a cult act as the decoration with flowers.

[93] For Severus as corrupter of the army's discipline, cf. Cassius Dio, LXXVI, 15, 2 (ed. Boissevain) and esp. Herodian, III, 8, 5.

[94] Cassius Dio, LXXIX, 28, 1–3 (ed. Boissevain).

[95] SHA., vit. Sev. Alex. 53 f. "Corrupta disciplina" is a stock topic of the Scriptores, but in this case the fact is attested by Dio, LXXX, 4 (ed. Boissevain, III, p. 475 f.).

authorities to the tastes of the soldiers. In the early years of Severus Alexander's reign, the period to which the document belongs, there was special need for him to retain the favour of the army, which had helped to raise him to power. Any interference with the conditions of camp-life would have been imprudent.[96] The course of his reign showed that he had little control over the soldiers, in spite of his biographer's praise of his uncompromising firmness, and mutinies were common. Disturbances among the Eastern legions [97] showed that they were as little reliable as any. If it is unlikely that it was Severus Alexander himself who actually included the two *rosaliae signorum* in the military calendar, the circumstances of his time make it easy to understand why he was politic enough to leave them there.

A military religion which could admit of the official celebration of two such festivals as these in the Roman camps of the Empire is very different from all current conceptions. That these celebrations are not peculiar to the Dura garrison is evident enough from the character of the *Feriale Duranum* as a standard official *feriale*. Its contents have already done much to modify our views on the official religion of the Roman imperial army in general.[98] Whereas it was commonly accepted that that army celebrated no festivals except those of the reigning emperor and the *natalis aquilae*,[99] this *feriale* has made plain that there was no such divorce between its official religion and that of the civil public calendars. "Das römische Heer lebt auch im Frieden das Leben des Krieges, das keine Feiertage kennt" [100] expresses a profound misconception. As we now know, the imperial army fêted the anniversaries of leading events not only in the life of the reigning emperor but also in those of the *divi*. It celebrated even those ancient *feriae* of the

[96] Cf. the fear of the praetorians at this time that a strict commander like Cassius Dio might be placed over them, Cassius Dio, LXXX, 4, 2 (ed. Boissevain, l.c.).

[97] Cassius Dio, LXXX, 4, 1 f. (ed. Boissevain, l.c.) (Mesopotamia); Herodian, VI, 4, 7.

[98] The bearing of the *Feriale Duranum* on military religion in general will be discussed at length in the main publication.

[99] von Domaszewski, op. cit., pp. 13–20; A. D. Nock in C. A. H., X (1934), p. 483.

[100] von Domaszewski, op. cit., p. 13.

oman people which still enjoyed most popularity. And it had few festivals connected with purely military anniversaries. his is unexpected enough. But if the conclusion reached in his paper is correct, then festivals are officially prescribed for which have no claim to observance on any of these grounds. he presence of the *rosaliae signorum* in this list has little more stification than the opportunity they give for rejoicing and errymaking. They are indeed the unique representatives in he *Feriale Duranum* of this type of festival. To find even them here, however, is surprising and significant.

THE LATIN VERSIONS OF ACTS KNOWN TO THE VENERABLE BEDE

BY

M. L. W. LAISTNER

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

THAT Bede knew and used several Latin versions of Acts is abundantly clear from his own statements. Moreover, his special interest in this book of the New Testament is suggested by the fact that he composed two separate commentaries on it and may have proceeded, in part at least, from the comparative neglect of Acts by earlier commentators. Neither Bede's Commentary on Acts nor his Retractation can be dated precisely, but this much can be regarded as certain, that the former is an early work, while the latter was composed towards the end of his life. Thus twenty years or more may have elapsed before Bede, following the example of the *eximius doctor Augustinus*, revised errors that he had committed in the Commentary, defended himself against the attack of critics, and added much new material that was the fruit of his ripest scholarship.[1] In both expositions we find frequent references to several Latin manuscripts of Acts — *quidam codices* or *quidam Latini codices* — as well as to more than one Greek version, *Graeca exemplaria*;[2] in

[1] The Retractation is not included in the list of his own works given by Bede in H. E., , 24, and it is therefore a reasonable assumption that it was written after 731. Plummer (ed. of H. E., I, cxlvii) dates the Commentary between 709 and 716, since it was composed before the Commentary on Samuel (c. 716), but after Acca became bishop f Hexham (709). The date of Acca's elevation to the episcopate seems certain, and Bede in his dedicatory epistle addresses him as bishop. Nevertheless Plummer overlooked that Bede in his comment on Acts 13, 21 makes an error in O. T. chronology which he had already corrected in the De temporibus, published in 703. It is surprising that Bede, even though, as he tells us, he composed the Commentary in a hurry, should have left uncorrected a chronological error for which he had been much criticised. Hence one wonders whether, owing to Acca's urgent request, he utilised notes on Acts that he had made much earlier, without stopping to revise them. In this way the mistake committed a good many years before 709 might have been overlooked, whereas, if the comment on Acts 13, 21 had been composed in 709, Bede must have given the chronology found in De Temp., in the De temporum ratione, and finally also in the Retractation.

[2] Cf. the full list of allusions to manuscripts of the Bible or parts of it given by Plummer, H. E., I, liv, note 7.

both, but especially in the Retractation, Bede paid great attention to textual criticism and to a comparison of manuscripts accessible to him. Many, but not all, of Bede's readings have been included in the great edition of the Hieronymic version of Acts by Wordsworth and White. Unfortunately these editors were compelled to rely on the printed editions of Bede's works, and these give an entirely false picture of Bede's text and of his Biblical citations. Giles' shocking edition was made from late manuscripts, and the O. L. readings in Bede given by Wordsworth and White from Sabatier are not trustworthy either. Thus not a few corrections need to be made in the Bede citations given by Wordsworth and White in their critical appendix. In the present article, which does not pretend to be either exhaustive or final in its conclusions, the quotations from Bede's Commentary are based on a complete collation of fifteen manuscripts. All of these were copied before 900, four being not later than 820, and six not later than 850. The citations from the Retractation are based on a collation of seven manuscripts. Two of these were copied in the first quarter of the ninth century, one between 850 and 900, two belong to the beginning of the tenth century, and one each to the twelfth and early thirteenth.[3] One other codex is not without importance, a much abbreviated conflation of the Commentary and Retractation. described more fully in a note at the end. Thus, with the help of a Bede-text based on the testimony of the oldest manuscripts, an attempt may be made to define more closely than could be done in the past the Latin versions of Acts consulted by Bede. It should be emphasised that in all the Acts quotations from Bede which are given hereafter the testimony of the Bede MSS. is unanimous, unless the contrary is specifically stated.[4] There are many places where the MSS. authority is

[3] Mss. of the Retractation are relatively rare. I know of 24 as against 80 of the Commentary.

[4] The following abbreviations are used hereafter:

Co. and Re. = Bede's Commentary and Retractation respectively.
Vg. = Jerome's Vulgate as given in the text of Wordsworth and White.
W.–W. = Wordsworth and White.
O. L. = Old Latin.

The usual sigla have been used for Bible MSS.

divided, but I have intentionally omitted these from consideration here. They will be available for study in my forthcoming edition of Co. and Re., but they cannot safely be used to solve the problem with which we are now concerned.

1. Jerome's Vulgate

The text that Bede used most consistently in both his expositions for the quotations from Acts on which he saw fit to write comments is A(miatinus). This MS. left England c. 716, but there were two other copies of this version in Northumbria after that date, which Bede could use in Re (H.A., 15; Anon., H.A., 20). His dependence on A is proved by a vast number of cases, but it is not necessary to give more than a selection taken from both Co. and Re.

		Vg.	A and Bede
Acts	2, 28	notas fecisti mihi	notas mihi fecisti A, Re.
	5, 32	et nos sumus testes	et nos testes sumus A, Re.
	7, 31	ego deus patrum	ego dominus patrum A (alone), Re.
	7, 43	Rempham	Remfam A, Co.[5]
	7, 51	duri cervice . . . resistitis	dura cervice . . . restitistis A, Re.[6]
	8, 33	quoniam tollitur de terra	quoniam tolletur a terra A, Co.[7]
	12, 15	illi autem dicebant	illi vero dicebant A (alone), Co.
	13, 2	separate	segregate A, Co., Re.
	15, 2	alii ex illis	alii ex aliis A, Co.
	16, 12	prima partis Macedoniae	prima parte Macedoniae A, Co.
	16, 25	laudabant deum	deum hymnum dicebant A (alone), Co.
	21, 27	dum autem septem	dum enim septem A, Co.
	22, 28	multa summa	multa pecunia A, Co., Re.
	28, 2	pyra	pruna A, Re.[8]
	28, 3	aliquantam multitudinem	multitudinem (om. aliquantam) A, Co.

However, Bede's general reliance on an A-text did not prevent him from occasionally expressing open dissent from one of its readings, as can be seen in the following instances. In the ex-

[5] Mss. of Co. are not unanimous, but there is a strong preponderance for Remfam. Aug. lxxvii (c. 815) has both in successive lines, the conflated MS. Aug. cxxxv has Rempham in both cases.

[6] One MS. (early 10th c.) has duri.

[7] tollitur is found in one MS. only.

[8] One MS. (late 9th c.) reads pyra; in one (10th c.) a corrector has altered pruna to pyra.

planation of Acts 2, 34 in Co. we read, *dicit dominus domino meo*, in fourteen MSS. Only one (late ninth c.) has *dixit*, and in one *dicit* has been changed to *dixit* by a reviser. In Re. all the MSS. read, *dixit dominus domino meo*, and Bede's comment is as follows:

> *quidam codices habent*, dicit dominus, *sed Graeca exemplaria et in hoc libro et in psalterio* (109, 1) *habent*, dixit dominus.

There can be no doubt that, when alluding to *quidam codices*, Bede is thinking in the first instance of A. Again in Co., when discussing Acts 18, 18, Bede remarks, *quidam codices plurali numero habent*, totonderunt caput *et* habebant votum. This corresponds to the A-text; indeed, according to W.–W., *totonderunt* is found nowhere else. Years later in Re. Bede reverted to this much disputed passage. In addition to appealing once more to the authority of Augustine and Jerome,[9] which had caused him to reject the readings of A in Co., he turns directly to the Greek text for support. At Acts 2, 1 six MSS. of Co. — all of them belong to the early group — read with A, *dies pentecosten*, the other nine have *pentecostes*. There can, however, be no doubt that the former was in Bede's text when he composed Co.; for towards the end of his life he was at pains to correct his error. In Re. *dies pentecostes* is found in all MSS., and Bede's exposition there begins, *male quidam codices habent* pentecosten, which, as he proceeds to explain, is ungrammatical, because you cannot have a noun in the accusative depending on a noun in the nominative. As we have already hinted, this reliance of Bede on an A-text is of no little value to a modern editor of his two commentaries. Often, where the MSS. are divided between an A-reading and one surviving in the 'Alcuinian' recension, it is safe to say that the true reading in Bede is that which agrees with A. This is further demonstrated by the frequency with which correctors in some of the *codices* have changed such readings to conform with the text current in their time, and some of these emenders are contemporary or nearly contemporary with the manuscripts themselves.

When we pass to other texts of Vg. that Bede consulted, we

[9] Aug. Ep. 82 (CSEL, 34, 358, 5); Jer. Ep. 112 (CSEL, 55, 378, 11–13).

find that we are dealing with probability rather than certainty. We may first consider six passages where he tacitly deviates from A.

	Vg.	A	Bede
Acts 1, 6	convenerant	convenerunt	convenerant Co.
4, 12	in alio aliquo	in aliquo alio	in alio aliquo Co.
4, 22	factum erat	factum fuerat	factum erat Co.
9, 24	factae sunt Saulo	factae sunt Saulo	factae sunt Paulo Re.
10, 30	nudiusquartana	nudiusquartana	nudiusquarta Co., Re.
26, 2	sim defensurus	sim defensurus	sis defensurus Co.

A glance at the critical apparatus of W.–W. will show that there is only one text of Acts which is, so to say, a common denominator, namely T(oletanus). T alone agrees with Bede in every one of these places. From this we may tentatively conclude that he had access to a Vg. manuscript which, if extant, would belong to the third, or Spanish, group in W.–W.'s classification. At the same time we must not lose sight of the possibility that Bede in some or all of these passages was following a lost O. L. version, and we must remember that, as Souter has pointed out, the British text of Acts apparently used by Pelagius two centuries earlier was related to those used in Africa and Spain.[10]

A third type of text, with which Bede seems undoubtedly to have had some acquaintance, was what we may call an ancestor of the Book of Armagh (D); for the correspondences between D and Bede, if not numerous, are too remarkable to be accidental.

At Acts 2, 23 we read in Co. *adfligentes* (*adfigentes* Vg.) in twelve out of fifteen manuscripts. In four of these, moreover, *adfligentes* has been emended by a corrector to the Vg.-reading. In Re. Bede tacitly rejected the reading of D, for all seven codices of Bede give *adfigentes*. At Acts 10, 33 Re., like D, omits *nos* after *omnes*, while at 13, 21 Co. with D and some others omits *deus*.[11] Re. further agrees with D in Acts 19, 9, *cuiusdam Tyranni*, where Vg. omits *cuiusdam* and a few MSS. read *Tyranni cuiusdam*. At Acts 22, 7 Re. comments: *in Graeco et in hoc loco additum est*, durum est tibi contra stimulum calcitrare. D alone has this addition exactly as quoted by Bede,

[10] A. Souter, Pelagius' Exposition of thirteen Epistles of St. Paul, I, 169.

[11] W.–W. are wrong in saying that the Bede-text has *deus*.

whereas all the O. L. versions, including e, differ slightly. The interpolation (Acts 22, 28) found in D — *quam facile* (+*est* D^1) *te civem romanum dicis* — is quoted in Co. in almost identical words: *alia editio manifestius quid dixerit insinuat.* Dixit tribunus: tam facile te dicis civem romanum esse? The rest of Bede's citation — *ego enim scio quanto pretio civitatem istam possedi* — has as its only parallel the Greek addition in D gr.[12] The Latin is doubtless Bede's own translation; for, when he composed Re., he felt that further elucidation was necessary and suggested *civilitatem* as a better equivalent for πολιτείαν than *civitatem.* Both in Co. and Re. we find, in place of Vg. *nauclerio* (Acts 27, 11), *nauclero.*[13] The latter reading is also found in T and some other MSS. But, since in Co. Bede comments, *nauclerus Graece, Latine navicularius,* and D* here reads *navicularius* (D^{mg} *naviclero*), we seem to have additional proof that Bede was familiar with a D-text. Finally, in commenting on the words, *reficiebant nos omnes* (Acts 28, 2), Bede remarks, *in Graeco scriptum est,* recipiebant nos omnes. Now *recipiebant* is found in D alone; at the same time it is possible that our author is here independently translating the Greek προσελάβοντο. We have already, in discussing Bede's occasional criticisms of A, alluded to his correction of *Pentecosten* to *Pentecostes* in Acts 2, 1. When he uses the plural, *male quidam codices habent,* he clearly has more than one codex in mind; and we may hazard the guess that he is thinking also of the D-text, which with A is one of the few that preserve this reading. The presence in Northumbria of an 'Irish' text of Acts in Bede's time is not surprising in view of the close connection between that area and Celtic Christianity. It is interesting to note also that the text of D in the Pauline Epistles has substantial affinities with the Biblical text familiar to Pelagius.[14]

Two other extant Vg.-texts of Acts are connected with Britain

[12] All the Bede MSS. read civitatem, not civilitatem as given by W.–W. and, following them, J. H. Ropes, The text of Acts 215, note. Both editors also omit te from Bede's text.

[13] Only one MS. of Co. gives *nauclerio.* All the MSS. of Re. have *nauclero,* save one with the ungrammatical *nauclerus.*

[14] Cf. Souter, op. cit., I, 137.

in the late seventh or eighth century. The codex F(uldensis), which passed into the possession of Boniface, may have been in Northern England when Bede was at Jarrow, but the evidence is not quite conclusive.[15] The manuscript of Acts, O (Oxford, Bodleian, Selden Supra 30), was written in England, 'probably in a Kentish centre,' in the first half of the eighth century.[16] Either O, or, if it was not written until after Bede's death, the text from which it was copied, might thus have been known to him. It has, however, been impossible to find a clear trace of either F or O in Bede's two commentaries.

2. Old Latin Versions

We are on safer ground when we turn to the O. L. text most consistently used by Bede. The Latin version (e) in Laudianus gr. 35 (E) was familiar to Bede when he was still a young man, for it is quoted occasionally in Co. Then in Re., in which Bede paid far more attention to textual criticism and to the study of the Greek original, e is the O. L. text that he reproduces in the great majority of instances where he appeals to a second version. Indeed the occasions on which he transcribes e are so numerous that, as in the case of the A readings, we must content ourselves with a few typical examples. We may begin with some from Co.:

Acts 9, 1 spirans minarum Bede, e (aspirans minarum Vg.).

10, 38 Bede comments: *alia editio dicit*: sicut unxit eum deus (= e alone).

[15] Ropes, op. cit., cxxix, says, without qualification, that F 'lay in Northumbria in the late years of the seventh and early years of the eighth century,' but what is his authority for so positive a statement? Even J. Chapman, whom he seems to be following, is not so categorical. Chapman (Early History of the Vulgate Gospels 157 and 158) argues that Boniface took the codex with him from England and that he obtained it from Jarrow or Wearmouth. But the evidence that he offers, though of some weight, still leaves the matter in doubt, and this Chapman himself seems to have felt. Later in the same book (188) he more cautiously remarks: 'The Codex Fuldensis and the Codex Laudianus of Acts are possibly two of the volumes brought to Northumbria by St. Benet Biscop, and they still survive.' H. Leclercq (Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie, s.v. Fulda) is more non-committal in sketching the wanderings of this famous manuscript, though he admits that the Insular glosses in it may have been written by Boniface himself.

[16] E. A. Lowe, Codices Latini Antiquiores, II, no. 257.

14, 2 Bede comments: *quod in Graeco sequitur*, deus autem pacem fecit (= e), *quidam Latini codices minus habent.* All the MSS. of Vg. omit this addition, except D, which reproduces it in different words.

14, 6 Bede comments: *sequitur in Graeco*, et commota est omnis multitudo in doctrina eorum (= e). Paulus autem et Barnabas morabantur in Lystris (= e). *Et hi quoque versiculi in quibusdam nostris codicibus non habentur.* All the Vg. MSS. known to Bede omit these additions.

18, 23 Bede comments: *alia translatio habet*, profuit multum credentibus per gratiam (= e).

24, 6–8 Bede comments: *in hoc loco quidam nostri codices aliquot versus habent qui in Graeco ita leguntur*, quem adprehendimus et secundum nostram legem voluimus iudicare. Transiens autem Lysias tribunus cum multa vi de manibus nostris eduxit, iubens accusatores eius venire ante te, quo possis ipse iudicans de omnibus istis cognoscere, *et cetera* (= e).[17] W.–W. omit verse 7, which is found, however, in a good many Vg. MSS., including A^1 and D; but it is only with e that Bede's wording corresponds exactly.

Out of a great number of e quotations in Re. it will suffice to give four:

Acts 5, 38 Bede comments: *in Graeco plus habet*, non coinquinantes manus vestras (= e).

7, 31 Bede comments: *in Graeco ita scriptum est*; facta est vox de caelo dicens ad eum: ego sum deus patrum tuorum, solve calciamenta de pedibus tuis. Locus enim in quo stas, terra sancta est. This corresponds to e save for the plural, calciamenta (calciamentum e).[18]

10, 45 Here Bede tacitly abandons Vg. and cites the second part of the verse on which he is going to comment in the form in which it appears in e alone: et obstipuerunt ex circumcisione fideles qui venerant cum Petro, quia et in gentibus donum sancti spiritus effusum est (quia et in nationes gratia spiritus sancti effusa est Vg. W.–W. ignore Bede here).[19]

20, 4 Bede comments: *plus autem habet in Graeco*, comitatus est autem cum eo usque Asiam (= e).[20]

---

[17] Six MSS. read 'versus minus habent,' but this is clearly a later correction, because Bede's words are a little ambiguous. It seems likely that he is thinking in part of A and the corrector of A who adds verse 7. Three MSS. representing one group have *diiudicans*.

[18] Three MSS. omit sum; two give dominus for deus. All read *patrum* (*fratrum* W.–W. wrongly).

[19] One MS. (12th c.) has *sancti spiritus*.

[20] W.–W. attribute to Bede the reading usque ad Asiam, but this is found in only one MS. (10th c.) of the seven.

There can be no doubt that e was not the only O. L. version known to our author. It is less easy to determine the exact character of the other version or versions that he may have consulted. Nevertheless the available evidence, set out below, is not without significance.

Acts 1, 12 reversi sunt Hierusalem Co. with G d gig p Aug. (Hierosolymam Vg.)

1, 15 om. simul Co. with gig p* Aug.

26, 10 Bede comments: *alia editio dicit*, occidendique (*var. lect.* occidendisque) eis detuli sententiam. This is peculiar to Bede.

27, 15–16 Bede comments: *haec alia translatio manifestius edidit*, et arrepta navi, cum non possent occurrere vento, commodata navi flatibus colligere vela coeperunt. Tunc transcurrimus insulam quae dicitur Caude (*var. lect.* Caudi); quam occupare non potuerunt, sed scapha missa adiuvare coeperunt navem praecingentes eam. Trahebant autem et anchoras, timentes ne occurrerent in Syrtes.[21]

We have quoted the passage in full, as it raises a question of some difficulty. The words, *et arrepta* to *possent*, are found also in gig; for the rest the wording is peculiar to Bede, who after some six lines of explanation goes on to quote part of Acts 16–17 in the Vg. text and then comments on that. W.–W., following Sabatier, treat the whole passage as an exact rendering of the interpolated passage in Acts, but it is perhaps more likely that Bede, from *quam occupare* to the end, is paraphrasing the Greek text rather than translating it.[22] He then goes on to comment on the words, *summisso vase sic ferebantur*, in the Vg. rendering: *alia translatio sic ponit*, timentesque ne in Syrtim (var. lect. Syrtem) exciderent laxantes antennam ita ferebantur. Again the rendering is peculiar to Bede. As he would hardly, being a modest man, allude to his own translation as *alia translatio*, we presumably have here a fragment from an O. L. text.

[21] The app. crit. of W.–W. is wrong in several particulars, since Sabatier clearly relied on late MSS. of Bede or an edition based on such. It is particularly to be noticed that Bede read Caude, not Claude, and thus supports the better reading. Souter, Novum Testamentum Graece, ad. loc., should be corrected accordingly.

[22] As for the words, *colligere vela coeperunt*, they correspond to the Greek *ὑστελλαντες τὰ ἱστία*. Of this Ropes (op. cit., 243, 15) says: 'Cassiodorus and Bede, but no other Latin witnesses, clearly refer to that part of the "Western" text found in 614, (= Milan, Bibl. Ambros. E 97 sup.).

We may now pass to the more numerous O. L. readings, not taken from e, that occur in Re.

Acts 1, 5 Bede comments: *unde et in quibusdam codicibus ita interpretatum invenimus,* quia Iohannes quidem tinxit aqua, vos autem tinguemini in spiritu sancto.
tinxit Re. only tinguemini Re. e p*

2, 2 de caelo sonitus
Vg. and Co. sonus Sonitus Re. and Vigilius [23]

3, 20 Bede comments: *in quadam translatione hunc versum ita propter explanationem sensus positum invenimus,* ut, cum venerint tempora refrigerii, veniant et vobis a facie domini.
Re. only. Bede's own explanation of the Greek follows.

4, 1 Bede in his exposition remarks: *Latine in quibusdam codicibus* praepositum templi, *in aliis rectius* praetorem templi *scriptum invenimus.*
praepositum e praetorem h

4, 13 Bede explains: idiotae *autem proprie* inperiti *vocantur.*
inperiti gig p

5, 39 Bede remarks: *et hic in Graeco plus habet,* neque vos neque principes vestri.
principes D dem gig

8, 1 remanserunt in Hierusalem. This O. L. addition is found in Augustine and several O. L. versions (but not in e), but only t preserves it in the exact form in which it is quoted in Re.

13, 8 Bede comments: *et hic quoque in Graeco habetur plus,* quoniam libenter audiebat eos.
audiebat eos Re. d eorum audiebat e (Correct W.–W. here)

21, 39 Bede explains: *pro* municipe *quidam codices* civem *habent.*
civem d e

22, 17 Bede remarks: *quidam codices habent* mentis excessum, *alii* pavorem, *alii* alienationem. This is a remarkable passage, as it implies that our author had consulted many MSS.; yet none of these variants is known in this verse. In Acts 10, 10, however, where Vg. has mentis excessus, p* gives mentis alienatio and e mentis pabor. This would seem to suggest that Bede in his exposition of 22, 17 was thinking of the earlier verse and of the variants that he had there observed without including them in his comment on 10, 10.

27, 13 existimantes propositum
existimantes Re. s aestimantes Vg.

---

[23] I know of no evidence to show that Bede knew Vigilius, De trinitate.

We may perhaps draw two conclusions legitimately from the above evidence. First, it is certain that, though e was the O. L. text on which he chiefly relied, Bede was acquainted with another that differed substantially from any now extant. Second, it is a notable fact that no less than five instances of correspondence between Bede and p occur; and p in the passages where it agrees with Bede's quotations is an O. L. translation.[24] It thus seems probable that, besides e, Bede had recourse to two other examples of the *Vetus Latina*, one of which has quite disappeared, while the other had strong affinities with certain existing versions; and this plurality of MSS. accords with and explains his recurring use of the plural, *codices quidam*. The consonances with p, moreover, and that with t suggest that the third version of the O. L. was a Spanish text or an African text revised in Spain.[25]

In one respect Bede's language is not wholly free from ambiguity; for the frequent use of phrases like, *sequitur in Graeco*, *in Graeco scriptum est*, might lead one to assume that he is himself translating directly from a Greek text. Actually, in the vast majority of cases, the translation that is supplied corresponds exactly to e. Thus, while Bede, especially when he composed Re., undoubtedly studied the Greek original, he mostly reproduced the Latin version (e) preserved in the same manuscript (E gr.) to which he usually turned for the Greek text of Acts. But the two, as is well known to New Testament scholars, by no means correspond exactly, a fact of which Bede was himself aware, as certain passages quoted below will show. At all events, on the rare occasions when he introduces a translation unknown in any extant MS. of O. L. with a specific reference to the Greek text, a doubt might arise whether the Latin equivalent is his own or taken from a lost O. L. version. The few examples that can be quoted leave no doubt that in each case Bede is himself responsible for the variant.

[24] Cf. the excellent description of p in Ropes, op. cit., cviii–cix.

[25] One passage seemed too doubtful to include in the text above. In commenting on Acts 9, 26 in Co., Bede cites 26, 20 in the following form: *in omni regione* (so A: *omnem regionem* Vg.) *et gentibus praedicabam* (*adnuntiabam* Vg.). W.–W. quote no MS. authority for *praedicabam*, but *praedicavi* is the reading of h. However, it is safest to assume that Bede was here quoting from memory.

Acts 1, 13 Re. — *nam et in Graeco ita positus est ordo verborum*, et cum introissent in cenaculum ascenderunt ubi erant manentes Petrus et Iohannes, etc. Since Bede goes on to give the order of the disciples' names as found in the Greek, it is probable that manentes (habitantes e) is his own, more accurate, rendering of καταμένοντες.

2, 24 Re. — *verum, si graecam inspexerimus auctoritatem ubi scriptum est*, quem deus suscitavit, solvens per ipsum dolores mortis iuxta quod non erat possibile teneri illum ab eo, etc.
(dolores inferni: propter quod: detineri e)

Bede retains the translation of e in the main, but makes some minor changes, notably mortis to correspond with θανάτου in E gr.

5, 24 Re.— ut audierunt autem verba haec sacerdotes et magistratus templi et principes sacerdotum mirabantur et ambigebant de his quidnam vult esse hoc. In the main this reproduces the text of e, but the first three words are given as in A, while mirabantur et ambigebant de his (mirari coeperunt et confundebantur mente de eis e) is Bede's terser and neater rendering of ἐθαύμαζον καὶ διηπόρουν in E gr.

8, 4 Re.—*pro* dispersis *in Graeco* disseminatos *habet, id est,* διασπαρέντες. This is clearly Bede's own equivalent.

8, 37 Co. Bede quotes the additional verse, omitted from the text of W.–W., thus: dixit autem ei Philippus: si credis ex toto corde tuo, salvus eris. Respondens autem dixit: credo in Christum filium dei. This is the rendering of e save that Bede has added 'tuo' from E gr.[26]

18, 28 Re. — *in Graeco ita scriptum est*, publice et per domos ostendens (in domo e). Bede is dissatisfied with e's rendering of κατ' οἶκον and substitutes his own equivalent for the Greek.

21, 25 Re. Bede reproduces e exactly save that — correct Latinist that he is — he alters 'crediderunt homines' to 'crediderunt hominibus.'

To sum up: our investigation of Bede's quotations from Acts shows that Bede relied primarily on an A-text of Vg. and on the O. L. version, e. In addition we have tried to show — with what success the reader must judge for himself — that he at various times consulted not less than two other MSS. of Jerome's translation and two of the Vetus Latina which differed substantially from e. His allusions to Greek manuscripts in the

[26] Six MSS. add 'eunuchus' after *respondens autem*, the other nine and Aug. cxxxv rightly omit it. It is clearly a gloss that crept in later to explain the unexpressed subject of *dixit*.

lural proves that E gr. was not the only text of the original hat he knew, and we have recorded above two undoubted ranslations of phrases not found in E gr.[27] But the data avail- ble are insufficient to define more precisely the character of his second Greek manuscript of Acts.

APPENDIX

Ms. Karlsruhe, Augiensis cxxxv

Among the Bede MSS. from Reichenau that now repose in he Badische Landesbibliothek at Karlsruhe is one (Augiensis xxxv) that, according to the printed catalogue, contains Bede's Commentary on Acts on ff. 1^{v} to 31^{v}. The late A. Holder in his nasterly catalogue of the Augienses rarely made mistakes, but n this instance he failed to note the true character of the manu- cript that he was describing. It is in fact a conflation of Co. nd Re. with large sections omitted from both.[28] The MS. was vritten in the early part of the tenth century, but I have so far ound no clue to the authorship of this compilation. Where Bede has commented on the same passage of Acts in both his reatises the abbreviator usually quotes from Re. first. He betrays a certain fondness for *Graeca*, while rather ignoring the nore difficult theological passages. Aug. cxxxv is of importance olely for one reason — it provides a link with a lost Insular nanuscript of Bede's two commentaries, which may have been vritten in the eighth century and which in any case cannot be ater than c. 800. It is so closely related to Augiensis lxxvii, a odex copied very early in the ninth century and containing both Co. and Re., with which it shares a number of readings ound in none of the other MSS., that one's first impulse is to assume that Aug. lxxvii is the manuscript used by the abbrevia-

[27] Cf. p. 42 above for a parallel with *Codex Bezae* (D gr.), and for another see note 22.

[28] I know of three other conflations of Co. with Re., namely, Dijon 153 (s. xii, from Citeaux), Oxford, Bodl. Laud. Misc. 268 (s. xiv) and Laud. Misc. 312 (s. x ex.). In each ase the printed catalogue describes the MS. as Bede's Commentary on Acts. These hree conflations are independent of one another, but I have not enough data at my isposal to say whether any of them is a copy of Aug. cxxxv.

tor of Aug. cxxxv. This, however, is impossible for two reasons. First, the later manuscript contains a number of readings not found in the earlier; and, second, in spite of its relatively late date, Aug. cxxxv preserves some Insular traits that are not found in Aug. lxxvii and which cannot therefore have been copied from it. These traces of an Insular exemplar are: eleven cases of the Insular sign for *autem*, one example of ꝫ for eius, and confusion on several occasions of *post* and *per*, that is to say, the abbreviator misread p̄ or p^{r} (= Insular *per*) as *post*. We must thus assume that Aug. lxxvii and Aug. cxxxv go back to a common ancestor written in Insular script. The probable relationship may be expressed thus: